

JPRS-TAC-87-040

16 JUNE 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-87-040

16 JUNE 1987

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: Reports, Comments on Draft Treaties ("various sources, various dates)	1
Soviet, U.S. Drafts	1
Reagan Announcement	2
U.S. Attitudes 'Contradictory', by Aleksandr Zholkver	2
ICEM's, Space Arms Linked	3
U.S. Seeks 'Build-Up'	3

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: Mid-May Reports, Comments on Progress of INF Talks (Various sources, various dates)	5
U.S. Resorts to 'Cunning', by Valentin Zorin	5
U.S., Soviet Drafts Contrasted	6
U.S. Plans for Nuclear Buildup	7
Portions of U.S. Draft Not 'Acceptable'	7
CPSU Politburo's Demichev Comments on Progress of Talks (TASS, 13 May 87)	8
USSR: Glasnost, INF Proposals 'Eroding Enemy Image' (Gennadiy Gerasimov; Moscow Television Service, 10 May 87) ...	9
TASS Cites Rogers as Opposed to Nuclear-Free Europe (IZVESTIYA, 4 May 87)	11

PRAVDA Assails U.S. on SRINF, FRG P-1A's, Alaska Deployments (Tomas Kolesnichenko; PRAVDA, 10 May 87)	12
TASS: Plans to Station B-52's in Europe 'Provocative' (KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 10 May 87)	15
Soviet Colonel on West European Attempts to 'Block' Agreement (V. Dodonov; APN DAILY REVIEW, 6 May 87)	16
Moscow Talk Show Critiques FRG, French, U.S. INF Attitudes (Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 10 May 87)	19
IZVESTIYA Views Chirac-Kohl Talks on INF, SRINF (Yu. Kovalenko; IZVESTIYA, 5 May 87)	24
USSR's Vorontsov Visits FRG, Discusses Geneva Talks (TASS, 6 May 87; DPA, 6 May 87)	25
Sees Genscher, Teltschik, Bahr Further Details	25
USSR: Reaction to 7 May Kohl 'Interim' Statement (TASS, 7 May 87; Moscow Domestic Service, 8 May 87)	27
'Evaded' Response to USSR Kohl 'Contradicted Himself', by Aleksey Sokolov	27
USSR's Falin Interviewed on Bonn's Disarmament Stance (DPA, 7 May 87)	29
Moscow Comments on Genscher May Talks in Washington (Moscow Television Service, 11 May 87; Moscow Domestic Service, 12 May 87)	31
'No Unanimity in Bonn', by Aleksandr Zholkver 'Half-Hearted, Vague Answer', by Igor Surguchev	31
USSR's Karpov Comments on FRG Approach to Disarmament (Werner Adam; FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 12 May 87)	33
TASS Cites Genscher: No FRG Decision on Soviet Proposal (TASS, 12 May 87)	36
USSR: French CP Leader Visits, Discusses INF, French Arms Plans (Various sources, various dates)	37
Interviewed in Yerevan	37
Holds Talks With Gorbachev	37
TASS Interview, G. Marchais Interview	40

FRG: Kohl Makes Government Statement of INF (Helmut Kohl; ARD Television Network, 7 May 87)	41
FRG: Genscher Discusses Double Zero Option in Bundestag (Hans-Dietrich Genscher; ARD Television Network, 7 May 87) ...	46
FRG Parliamentary Aide Doubts on Double-Zero Option (DPA, 14 May 87)	49
FRG Defense Minister: Europe Awaits German Decision (DPA, 15 May 87)	50
FRG's Genscher: Decision on Double-Zero Option Due Soon (DPA, 15 May 87)	51
FRG: Kohl Announces Position on Nuclear Disarmament (DPA, 15 May 87)	52
Kohl on Disarmament	52
'Text' of Kohl Declaration	53
Canada's Stand on INF Issues Discussed (THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 1 May 87; THE OTTAWA CITIZEN, various dates)	54
Clark Interview, by Jeff Sallot	54
CITIZEN 18 Apr Editorial	55
CITIZEN 24 Apr Editorial	56
CITIZEN 25 Apr Article, by George Grande	56
Briefs	
FRG Risks 'Isolation'	58
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
USSR's Karpov Suggests 'Equal' Conventional Force Reduction (BBC Television Network, 18 May 87; BBC World Service, 19 May 87)	59
Interview on BBC, by Fred Emery	59
BBC Comment	60
Soviet CSCE Envoy Sees 'Reason for Hope' (Yuriy Kashlev Interview; DIARIO 16, 9 May 87)	61
RELATED ISSUES	
CPSU Politburo's Demichev Comments on Arms Issues (PRAVDA, 14 May 87)	63

USSR's Kapitsa on Asian Security: Limit Submarine Activity (Mikhail Kapitsa Interview; THE HINDUSTAN TIMES, 2 Apr 87)	65
Soviet Papers Carry May Day Celebration Editorials (PRAVDA, 30 Apr 87; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 1 May 87)	66
PRAVDA 30 Apr	66
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 May	67
TASS Reports on UN Disarmament Commission Session (TASS, various dates)	69
Session Opens	69
Ukrainian Delegate Speaks	69
Bloc Proposes Naval Limits	70
Bloc Proposal on 'All Aspects'	70
Communist Editors Meet, Discuss Role in Peace Struggle (PRAVDA, 4 May 87)	72
TASS: Retired NATO, Pact Generals End Vienna Meeting (TASS, 7 May 87)	74
PRAVDA Report on European Socialists' Conference (Valeriy Volkov; PRAVDA, 8 May 87)	75
TASS on Alleged U.S. Plans for Neutron Arms Deployment in FRG (TASS, 8 May 87)	77
Washington, Bonn Silent	77
German CP Data	78
Soviet Officers Write on V-E Day (Various sources, various dates)	80
Minister of Defense, by S. L. Sokolov	80
First Deputy Minister, by Petr Georgiyevich Lushev	82
Deputy Minister Tretyak	83
Deputy Minister for Rear Services, by S. K. Kurkotkin	84
Chief of Staff, by S. F. Akhromeyev	85
Deputy Minister Views INF, Vitaliy Shanbanov Interview	89
Thai Foreign Minister Discusses Arms Issues in Moscow (Various sources, various dates)	92
Talks With Shevardnadze	92
Luncheon Remarks	92
Meets With Gromyko	95
Interviewed on Visit	96
'Joint Announcement' Published	97
Moscow Broadcast to Thailand	98

International Antiwar 'Dialogue' Opens in Moscow (TASS, 13, 15 May 87)	100
Zagladin Addresses Meeting	100
Further Details	100
Ends 15 May	102
TASS Report Honecker's Exchange With FRG's Vogel (TASS, 15 May 87)	104
Briefs	
Soviet Scientists' Meeting	105

/9986

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON DRAFT TREATIES

Soviet, U.S. Drafts

LD081852 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1759 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Geneva, 8 May (TASS) -- The Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons are continuing in Geneva.

The Soviet delegation is pursuing a consistent course aimed at successfully completing the preparations for a joint draft treaty on the problem of medium-range missiles (INF), and at ensuring progress in other areas of the talks as well. Objectively, all the necessary conditions exist for this. These have been created by the important accords reached by the leaders of the USSR and the United States in Reykjavik, and also by the new initiatives recently undertaken by the Soviet Union in all the spheres being scrutinized at the Geneva talks.

On 5 May of this year the Soviet delegation took another constructive step -- it proposed the coordination of "the key provisions of agreements" on a number of major disarmament problems, including strategic offensive weapons (SOW) and the reinforcement of the regime of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM). The Soviet side has presented an appropriate draft document. Together with an INF treaty this document could become the subject and principal result of a political accord at the summit level [na vysshem urovne] between the USSR and the United States, as well as a basis for preparing complete-format [polnoformatnyy] legally binding agreements.

The Soviet delegation also suggested agreeing to principles of restraint in the sphere of strategic offensive arms, including long-range sea-based cruise missiles, for the duration of the talks. This would mean the sides would refrain from exceeding currently existing levels of strategic offensive arms. The sense and importance of such a step are evident. It would create a favorable climate for the work of the delegations and for the preparation of agreements to limit and reduce arms.

The U.S. delegation has now submitted the U.S. draft treaty on strategic offensive arms. It will be studied. A number of its clauses take into account the accord reached in Reykjavik on a radical reduction of strategic offensive arms by both sides.

However, there is in the U.S. draft treaty a complete absence of a most important element: Consideration of the objectively existing mutual link between reductions in strategic offensive arms, prevention of the arms race in space, and the strengthening of the ABM Treaty regime.

The Soviet delegation stated firmly in this regard that preventing the arms race from emerging into space and preserving the ABM Treaty regime is a key problem for implementing the 50 percent reductions in strategic offensive arms. A clause is therefore needed when there is an accord on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, that if either of the sides decides to embark on the practical creation [sozdaniye] of an ABM system in space, the other side will have the right to consider itself free of the obligation to reduce strategic offensive arms.

The USSR delegation intends to continue trying to achieve in Geneva solutions that fully correspond to the agreed aim of the talks: to prevent the arms race in space, limit and reduce nuclear arms on earth, strengthen strategic stability, and ultimately liquidate nuclear weapons completely and universally.

Reagan Announcement

LD081919 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Washington May 8 TASS -- The White House announced today that the American delegation presented on May 8 a draft treaty on reducing the strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the USA at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons.

In today's written statement President Reagan pointed out that the American proposals were the result of intensive work of all U.S. governmental departments concerned and received his approval. Describing this draft treaty as an important indicator of the U.S. wish to reach major, equal and verifiable reductions in strategic armaments as soon as possible President Reagan stressed that he did not want to play down the existing complex problems.

In particular, the head of the White House described as totally unacceptable any proposals restricting the scale of the Star Wars programme whose implementation the USA is speeding up. Reagan said that he would not agree to any measures which would hamper or kill the Strategic Defense Initiative.

U.S. Attitudes 'Contradictory'

LD111946 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 11 May 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] As for Washington, the attitudes to our proposals are quite contradictory here. On the one hand, following the Soviet draft of key provisions of agreements on a number of major disarmament problems, the U.S. draft treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons of the United States and USSR has finally also been submitted in Geneva. Right away, however, President Reagan described as entirely unacceptable any proposals that would limit the scale of the U.S. Star Wars program.

Furthermore, THE NEW YORK TIMES has discovered that Weinberger submitted to Reagan a secret report calling for the implementation of this program to be speeded up; and in particular, to carry out, in the very near future -- before 1990 -- four space weapons tests. For this, the Pentagon chief proposes moving to the so-called broad interpretation of the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty, a treaty that bans such tests.

ICBM's, Space Arms Linked

LD122238 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 12 May 87

[Text] [Announcer] The chief Soviet negotiator at the arms talks in Geneva, Yuliy Vorontsov, told a news conference in Rome today that the Soviet Union is preparing to present a draft treaty on intercontinental nuclear missiles that will include a ban on deployment of weapons in space. He said: We have examined the American draft and it is not bad, but it lacks a very important element -- the element of space weapons. And so my question to you, Yuriy Minayev: Why is the issue of limiting intercontinental nuclear missiles connected to the issue of space weapons?

[Minayev] The draft submitted by the United States does not take into account the interrelationships existing between strategic and space weapons. The American Star Wars program, advocated by Ronald Reagan, would break the strategic balance which exists now and which must continue to exist during the phase of reducing intercontinental nuclear missiles. To make things clear I can say this: The Star Wars program is intended to destroy intercontinental missiles, which are under negotiation now. If the Soviet Union and the United States are going to scrap all missiles of this type, then why does the United States need this program? If they insist on it we can come to the conclusion that the American side is not going to scrap intercontinental missiles in order to use them for a possible attack in combination with space weapons. This is the interrelationship between these two types of weapons.

U.S. Seeks 'Build-Up'

LD131415 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 13 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 13 TASS -- Follows commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military news analyst:

According to Western press reports, Washington is proposing the British Government to deploy in Britain's territory strategic bombers B-52 and increase the number of F-111 aircraft so that if agreement on medium and shorter range missiles in Europe is reached, the power of the U.S. nuclear weapons to be eliminated be "made up for".

General Bernard Rogers, NATO allied commander in Europe, claims that any agreement on nuclear missiles in the European Continent should leave intact the current aggregate potential of the U.S. forward-based nuclear forces by ensuring for them the opportunity to "launch strikes against such targets as mobile Soviet missiles", "break through the Soviet air defence system", "reach the central part of Soviet territory" and ensure the "escalation (of nuclear war) by the medium range forces".

The U.S. draft agreement on strategic offensive weapons tabled in Geneva is actually based on the condition that a cut in the mass destruction weapons over a comparatively limited space of the earth's surface, should be "compensated" by the deployment of even more dangerous and numerous U.S. nuclear weapons in the truly infinite outer space.

The concept of arms control being put forward by Washington now diverges in a most cardinal way from the generally accepted notion of disarmament as a system of measures, whose implementation should lead to a total scrapping, or a considerable cut in the means of warfare and creating prerequisites for eliminating the threat of its

outbreak. Thus, in particular, the U.S. draft treaty tabled in Geneva is actually based on the absurd proposition of the White House "towards disarmament through a build-up of U.S. military power".

The Reagan administration assures world public of its preparedness to "cover an extra mile on the way to disarmament", but in real fact, Washington is, apparently, preparing to "go two extra miles" in the opposite direction.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1485

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: MID-MAY REPORTS, COMMENTS ON PROGRESS OF INF TALKS

U.S. Resorts to 'Cunning'

ED082012 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 8 May 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Reports from Geneva on progress in the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons are attracting the attention of the mass media throughout the world and are being published in the most prominent places.

Perhaps special attention is now being paid to the part of the talks devoted to drawing up a draft agreement on medium-range nuclear missiles. On that score one cannot but focus on the fact that U.S. correspondents in Geneva, evidently served by members of their delegation, are pursuing this tack in their reports: An agreement on removing U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles from Europe is near completion, and success in this direction depends on the Soviet Union.

That the first serious breakthrough in the nuclear missile race that has lasted through the postwar decades is within nearer reach than ever before, and that, provided there is goodwill, a corresponding agreement may be signed in the not too distant future, by all accounts reflects the genuine state of affairs. However, I think that for the time being there are no grounds for excessive euphoria on that score -- through no fault of the Soviet Union.

As far as the Soviet side is concerned, it has done all in its power to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe. Unfortunately, one cannot say that about Washington's position yet. While assuring the public of its readiness for a positive resolution of the problem the U.S. delegation in Geneva is, at the same time, piling up most definite obstacles on the path to a solution of that problem. I will cite this example: While ignoring that the Pershing 2 missiles are just the type of weapon the removal of which from positions in Europe is being discussed, wise men from the Pentagon have invented the following trick -- you cannot call it anything but that. We will remove not the whole of the Pershing-2 missile, they say, but only one of its two parts. Then that missile will have not a medium radius of action, but a limited one.

What is cunning about that? Well, first, during that operation all the complex infrastructure will be preserved: the launch positions, the equipment, and so on, which were set up during the siting [razmeshcheniye] of Pershing-2 missiles in

Europe. Second, all in all 48 hours are required for the reverse operation, that is, joining the previously removed second stage to the first stage. Inasmuch as all the launchers will, according to the Pentagon's plan, remain untouched, the intended plan is akin to the cunning of the monk who tried to convert pigs into crabs [perekresti porosya v karasya]. The essence of the plan is to preserve the offensive capability of the U.S. medium-range missiles, if in a disguised form, at the same time as the Soviet Union has to remove its SS-25 missiles from its launch positions. The very attempt by the U.S. side to act with cunning in the resolution of such vitally important problems cannot but arouse the anxiety of the public. All the more since this is not the only piece of cunning the U.S. delegation is resorting to these days at the talks.

Of course, it is premature to draw a conclusion as to whether it is a case of diplomatic maneuvering by the U.S. delegation, or whether an attempt is actually being made seriously to drag out the solution of the problem, the bases for which were laid in Reykjavik and discussed during the recent visit of Secretary of State Shultz to Moscow. Washington's real intentions, and accordingly, the possibility of achieving an accord on medium-range missiles, will become known in the next few weeks.

U.S., Soviet Drafts Contrasted

PM121551 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19, 10 May 87 p 5

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Firsthand Information": "At the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Centre"]

[Excerpt] At a recent briefing, Head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Gennadiy Gerasimov analyzed the Soviet and American proposals at the Geneva medium-range missiles talks. He pointed out that the Soviet draft treaty was in line with the formula produced in Reykjavik, i.e., the elimination of all medium-range missiles in Europe and the leaving of 100 warheads of Soviet Asia and 100 warheads in the United States. The Soviet draft incorporates important points of the earlier American draft. However, the American draft allows for a circumvention of the treaty. For example, it provides for converting Pershing-2 medium-range missiles into smaller-range missiles. The U.S. draft provides for putting the ground-based cruise missiles on naval vessels; it permits the development of new medium-range missiles; it proposes the deployment of 100 American warheads in Alaska, i.e., within range of the Soviet territory. The Soviet draft excludes chances of unilateral advantage for either side. It offers a simultaneous scrapping of Soviet and American medium-range missiles stage by stage, with each side eliminating at each stage in equal percentage of its missiles. It bans new types of medium-range missiles and provides for the strictest control measures. Control and inspection should be carried out everywhere: at the sites where medium-range missiles will be dismantled, or eliminated at test sites, military bases, depots and factories including those in third countries.

The Soviet approach to battlefield-tactical missiles in Geneva calls for the complete elimination of this type of weapon in Europe, including warheads carried by Pershing-1 missiles with which the Bundeswehr of the FRG is armed. As for Soviet and American battlefield-tactical missiles, there should be equal levels on a global basis. The Soviet Union suggested that a legal agreement on this score be urgently achieved. This could be a separate agreement or part of an agreement on medium-range missiles. Such an agreement, according to the Soviet side, could be prepared already this year.

U.S. Plans for Nuclear Buildup

LD120955 Moscow TASS in English 0927 GMT 12 May 87

[Text] Washington May 12 TASS -- As the newspaper WASHINGTON POST has learnt, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee has started a study of ways to build up U.S. nuclear power in Europe or near that continent, if a Soviet-American agreement is concluded on the elimination of medium- and short-range missiles in Europe. One of the proposed methods of a build-up of nuclear power is to deploy an additional number of submarines carrying nuclear-tipped cruise missiles against targets in the Warsaw Treaty member countries.

Portions of U.S. Draft not 'Acceptable'

LD140735 Moscow TASS in English 0641 GMT 14 May 87

["Geneva: An Hour of Pivotal Decisions" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS -- As a result of the latest Moscow initiatives, the Soviet-American dialogue on disarmament has acquired a new content, and history's first agreement on eliminating the entire class of nuclear weapons has become a reality, Spartak Beglov, a "MOSCOW NEWS" special correspondent, reports from Geneva. The article is carried in the newspaper's latest issue.

Describing the course of the negotiations on medium-range missiles, the author cites a statement by the deputy head of the Soviet delegation who noted that in its proposals the Soviet side had taken into account all constructive provisions contained, in its opinion, in the U.S. document tabled earlier. But the U.S. position, the special correspondent writes, contains, for the time being, elements with which the Soviet side cannot agree.

For instance, the U.S. document provides for liquidating only Soviet missiles at the first two stages while the American side could even build up medium-range missiles arsenals. Neither is acceptable the desire of the U.S. side to refit Pershing-2 missiles into shorter-range rockets and to get a chance to shift cruise missiles from ground bases in Western Europe to sea. It also wants to get a chance of deploying the remaining 100 warheads on Alaska, that is within the hitting range of the Soviet territory.

The author regards it a paradoxical situation when some Atlantic politicians who advocated quite recently the "zero option" on medium-range missiles, are now alarmed in the face of a real breakthrough in this question. Therefore, the West raised the issue of shorter-range missiles in the hope of providing a pretext for the American side to acquire such weapons. This is precisely what some U.S. allies mean when they insist on the so-called right of Americans to "parity." For its part, Washington is looking for another chance to draw its allies into the SDI programme, says the author.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CPSU POLITBURO'S DEMICHEV COMMENTS ON PROGRESS OF TALKS

LD131229 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 13 May 87

[text] Sofia May 13 TASS -- Petr Demichev, an alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and a first vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, said today that the Soviet Union's proposals and similar initiatives by other socialist countries have evoked a broadest international response.

Speaking at a rally at the Beroe Robotics factory in the Bulgarian city Stara-Zagora, he said that the far-reaching proposals made in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, 1986, the position taken by the USSR at the Reykjavik meeting, and its subsequent flexible policy in disarmament issues had created a new atmosphere in the world, containing action by the forces of militarism and aggression and furnishing real prerequisite conditions for agreements to cut back nuclear arms, deliver Europe from medium-range and theater missiles, and eliminate chemical weapons.

"Agreements on these missiles will make it possible to bolster the atmosphere of trust and pave the way for mankind to a nuclear-free world," Demichev said.

"This requires that Washington abandon its imperial ambitions, hegemonist claims, anti-communist prejudice, attempts to dictate to the whole world, and 'Star Wars' preparations," he added.

"We believe that new political thinking will become a force mobilizing all nations," Demichev continued.

He said the USSR Supreme Soviet was making active use of its possibilities to carry the truth about the foreign policy of the USSR and fraternal socialist countries to millions of people and step up parliamentarians' efforts to enhance international security.

Interparliamentary exchanges had lately become markedly brisker, reflecting a desire by most countries for mutual understanding and a search for ways of defusing international tension, Demichev noted.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: GLASNOST, INF PROPOSALS 'ERODING ENEMY IMAGE'

LD101808 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 May 87

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Simple human forgetfulness, according to the formula that everything passes [vse prokhodit] is neither the only nor the chief reason for our former U.S. ally's memory failure. The emergence of this blind spot in his eye, which destroys his historical view, is primarily the result of many years of cultivating the image of the enemy there, in the person of you and me. Now, under the new conditions of openness and democratization, this enemy image is being eroded. The more frankness [otkrovennost] we have in discussing our development problems, the more understandable our goals and priorities are to the rest of the world. The further we go to meet the West halfway, with the aim of eliminating its misgivings about our intentions -- even while knowing that these misgivings are fabricated -- the harder it will be to use us to frighten people there.

For the past few weeks, the West has been talking of nothing but the Soviet proposals for eliminating medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. If one removes oneself from the play of arguments and counterarguments -- you probably know these from the daily news -- the matter boils down to maintaining mistrust in us. What on earth have we thought up now? It is impossible that some sort of one-sided advantages are not concealed somewhere in the Soviet proposals, and so they are looking hard.

This is the old-fashioned way of thinking, regarding our relations, relations between East and West, as relations of head-on, strict rivalry. Meanwhile it is high time to think about cooperation in how to avert the universal nuclear danger.

Well, all the observers in the West write that we have the initiative. Recently a strategic review was published, drawn up by the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London. I do not remember seeing such a self-critical review for many years; it is published every year. Here is what you can read in it: The Soviet Union's new, dynamic leader has achieved his first successes in his attempts to bring Soviet policy out of its frozen state. He can be expected to portray Soviet policy in many other areas in a new and more positive light, thereby challenging the wisdom and will of the weakened U.S. Government, where there is an evident lack of fresh ideas and progressive processes.

As you can see, the authors of the strategic review are arguing in the platitudes of rivalry: Well, we get a good mark, while the United States gets a barely satisfactory

one. So, we should probably be pleased about it. We are indeed having success in the diplomatic and propaganda offensive; we do not deny these, of course. But our goal is not this transient and separate one. The goal should be a common one: the search for ways toward disarmament.

A paradoxical situation is coming out over our proposals on medium-range and operational and tactical missiles. Putting it schematically: the United States is manifesting rather greater readiness in this respect than Western Europe is. When Western Europe expresses fears that without these missiles, it will be left virtually weaponless, it is reminded -- not by Moscow but by the Pentagon -- that even after the proposed cuts, there will be 4,600 units of nuclear weapons left in NATO countries. Well of course, voices against can be heard in the United States, too, proving the presence there of people opposing all agreements on principle.

These people are afraid of the very start of a movement toward nuclear disarmament. For if there is an agreement on medium-range missiles and on operational and tactical missiles, then for the first time in all history, opposing sides will start eliminating weapons, actually reducing weapons and imply limiting them. So these people are afraid of the first step. What starts an advance of nuclear disarmament?

Well, Margaret Thatcher, Jacques Chirac, and Helmut Kohl are having consultations, but just cannot come to any final decision. Kohl, for example, was supposed to do that in a government statement on disarmament problems on 7 May, but he did not take any position, and said that he would merely sum up the interim result. In this interim result, Kohl -- like many others -- reiterated the arguments about the superiority of the Warsaw Pact countries in conventional weapons and spoke about the ability of the Warsaw Pact countries to invade Western Europe.

It is at least a good thing that there is less talk now about intentions regarding an invasion, but fears in regard to the capability of carrying out an invasion are still being repeated. It is added that in politics, one should proceed not from intentions -- these are subjective, just try and check -- but from the capabilities; these are objective and can be used. But, the Warsaw Pact is open for discussion on this issue, as well, in regard to capabilities. The NATO countries were invited to discussion at the last session of the Political Consultative Committee [PCC] of the Warsaw Pact member countries. This was held last summer in Budapest. The next PCC session will be held soon. Just the day before yesterday, Poland came forward with specific proposals to reduce military confrontation in Europe, precisely in connection with reducing the capability of invasion on both one side and the other.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS CITES ROGERS AS OPPOSED TO NUCLEAR-FREE EUROPE

PM071549 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 87 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report under the rubric "Reports from Abroad": "B. Rogers Stands Up For 'Deterrence'"]

[Text] London, 3 May -- The prospect of freeing the European continent of medium-range and short-range nuclear missiles which has become a real possibility as the result of the latest Soviet peace initiatives is clearly not to the liking of General Bernard Rogers, supreme commander NATO Allied Forces Europe.

In an interview with the newspaper THE GUARDIAN, he claimed that as a result of the Soviet proposals Western Europe now supposedly finds itself..."on a slippery slope" down which, heaven forbid, it could slide...into a "nuclear-free abyss." If we allow the Soviet Union to draw us in this direction without first settling the question of the balance of conventional armed forces, B. Rogers warns, the West Europeans will find themselves "vulnerable to blackmail, the threat of coercion," and so forth. Consequently it is essential to preserve the "deterrence factor," the NATO supreme commander said.

B. Rogers went on to speak in favor of refusing to dismantle the 100 U.S. cruise and Pershing-2 missiles until an agreement is reached to "rectify the imbalance" between East and West in chemical and conventional weapons. He also said that approximately 80 Pershing-2 missiles should be retained, "modernizing" them into short-range Pershing 1B missiles.

According to B. Rogers, the U.S. F-111 bombers based in Britain and the British Tornado aircraft capable of carrying both conventional and nuclear weapons must be an integral part of any "deterrence factor" worth having. The British and French national nuclear forces must also remain inviolable, Rogers stressed.

It is interesting that on the eve of the interview with the U.S. general, THE GUARDIAN carried a report by the Bradford University Center for the Study of Peace Problems whose authors conclude that the NATO countries are not lagging behind but even have an advantage over the Warsaw Pact in whole groups of conventional means of warfare and, in particular, in terms of warships and sea-based aircraft. This must be taken into consideration when analyzing the military situation in Europe, the report noted, and attempts to discuss any "imbalance" in forces in Europe in this sphere "appear quite unfounded."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA ASSAILS U.S. ON SRINF, FRG P-1A'S, ALASKA DEPLOYMENTS

PM130845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 May 87 Second Edition p 4

["International Review" by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Excerpt] Two Approaches

Yesterday we celebrated a great holiday -- Victory Day. It is 42 years since that unforgettable day when silence suddenly descended on Europe after the bloodiest war in human history. A new generation has grown up, one that has not known war and has only studied it in textbooks. But no one is forgotten, nothing is forgotten. For the sake of the memory of the dead and for the sake of the future of the living it is necessary to ensure that Europe and the whole world are forever rid of the threat of what would now be total annihilation. Time is of the essence, since our European home has become the biggest and most explosive nuclear weapons dump.

The Soviet proposals on medium-range missiles opened up, for the first time in fact, the real prospect of the destruction of an entire class of nuclear missiles. To take advantage of this opportunity would be to take an important step in ridding Europe of nuclear arsenals. So the attitude toward the medium-range missiles problem today is a kind of "moment of truth": Anyone can see who is prepared for new thinking in the nuclear age, for disarmament and a reduction in the level of armaments to reasonable sufficiency, and who is continuing to gamble on the arms race and on military-technological rivalry.

How do things stand today? To be blunt, the situation is not simple. The West, above all the United States, is full of "optimistic" prognoses, even saying that there is nothing to worry about -- an agreement is "just around the corner." At the same time, Washington and its chief allies are gradually piling up more and more obstacles. The purpose of them is to subject the mutual understanding reached in Reykjavik to revision and secure a one-sided military advantage. The same intention is evident in the U.S. draft treaty presented at the Geneva talks.

Take, for example, the question of operational and tactical missiles, which we are proposing to reduce to zero simultaneously with the "Zero option" on medium-range missiles in Europe. How many words and how much paper has Washington used to demonstrate that the Soviet advantage in operational and tactical missiles is the obstacle to the achievement of an agreement on the whole range of medium-range nuclear forces in Europe. But when we proposed the destruction of all operational and tactical missiles in Europe the United States immediately backtracked. Now it is advocating "equal levels," that is, the buildup of its own missiles, a new "arms upgrading." In

right to retain its nuclear missile potential in Europe, its wants to "turn" the U.S. medium-range missiles into operational and tactical missiles.

The United States is proposing that the Pershing-2s should not be removed from the USSR, but merely that one stage of the missile should be taken away and the electrical unit replaced and that is all: The Pershing-2 becomes the Pershing-1B. What kind of reduction is this? Moreover, it is known (special tests have been carried out at Martin Marietta plants) that the missile can be turned back into a Pershing-2 literally 48 hours, in fact it can be assembled at the actual launch installation.

Washington will not hear of the elimination of U.S. warheads for the last Pershing-1A missiles, which fall into the operational and tactical missile category, having a range of more than 700 km. They are "not ours," they say -- but the warheads are theirs, and what we are talking about is not missiles, but warheads which, along with all operational and tactical missiles, must be removed from Europe.

The U.S. proposal on the actual medium-range missile elimination process also sounds highly illogical. Wouldn't an equal percentage reduction be fair? And everyone can see that in view of the number of SS-20s, our reduction in this case would be larger than the U.S. reduction. But this is not enough for Washington, you see. It would like to "wait" until the overall levels are comparable -- and then only the USSR would dismantle its missiles under minute U.S. verification. It would be far more logical to reduce Soviet and U.S. missiles simultaneously by 50 percent. The verification system would operate immediately for both sides, and it would be a tough system, even involving verification at enterprises where the missiles are produced.

But here is the U.S. Administration's concept of "freedom to site" the remaining warheads -- ours in Asia and theirs on the territory of the United States. The USSR can't agree in this case the principle that one another's territory, as well as the territory of Western Europe, cannot be reached. We accept this, but Washington wants to retain the right to deploy its missiles in Alaska. Why, one wonders, should it accept the emergence of an additional threat to Siberia?

These and other U.S. counterproposals are being put forward to the strident requirement provided by devotees of "Atlantic solidarity" on both sides of the Atlantic. Every day brings new "doubts" and calls for "caution" and "restraint," while the "zero option" only benefits the Russians, apparently. Meanwhile couriers are shuttling between Washington and the NATO capitals -- they are pretending that they are "interring," but, in fact, they are temporizing. In the EEC the word is that the EEC will work out its attitude toward the Soviet proposals "no sooner than late fall." The West German paper GENERAL-ANZEIGER notes that "the Bonn coalition and the SPD government are of the opinion that the Soviet Union's 'zero option' proposal for operational and tactical missiles with a range of between 500 and 1,000 km is unacceptable." The other day Chancellor Kohl effectively confirmed this position.

Kohl also promised that an "all-European response" to the Soviet proposals would be worked out. It would be more correct to call it a response by not the most far-sighted figures in Western Europe who cannot imagine their continent without nuclear weapons, which is what the peoples are demanding. They are scarcely entitled to speak for the "whole of Europe," where the spectrum of political opinions even at government level is much wider than the NATO diehard line. For example, the resolution adopted the other day at the meeting of EEC countries' socialist and social democratic parties seemed quite different.

What makes this particularly important is the fact that the fervent Atlanticists, egged on by Washington, are currently searching for new options to fill the "breach" that they say could occur in the nuclear marriage between Western Europe and the United States in the event of the withdrawal of Pershing and cruise missiles from the continent. It is a question of setting up a West European missile defense system. The idea of this homegrown ABM system is closely associated with SDI, and is based on the U.S. Patriot missile and other U.S. space facilities. Since the ABM Treaty does not extend to Europe, there are opportunities for testing SDI there. Judging by what the U.S. delegation brought to round eight of the talks on nuclear and space armaments, which began this week in Geneva, the United States is continuing its "Star Wars" program, is drifting farther and farther away from Reykjavik, and is hardening its position.

We, however, took yet another constructive step in Geneva, when we proposed agreeing on the "key provisions of agreements" on a number of major disarmament problems, including strategic offensive armaments and the strengthening of the ABM Treaty setup. Together with the medium-range missile treaty, this paves the way for political accords between the USSR and the United States at the highest level [na vysshem urovne].

So, if you glance at the international palette as a whole, you see a plethora of colors. The Soviet Union is demonstrating a willingness to seek compromises and solutions. This offers a historic chance to create conditions for a nuclear-free world. But reciprocal steps by the U.S. side are needed if the chance is not to be missed. And there have not been any yet.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: PLANS TO STATION B-52'S IN EUROPE 'PROVOCATIVE'

PM130955 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 May 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Provocative Plans"]

[Text] New York, 9 May--The United States and its NATO allies are considering plans to station U.S. B-52 strategic bombers in Western Europe if a Soviet-U.S. treaty is concluded on eliminating nuclear missiles in Europe. This has been reported by THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, which cites an unnamed official with information on the course taken by the debates in NATO on the stand it is to take in response to the Soviet Union's latest proposals on missiles in Europe. The bombers are to be armed with cruise missiles with nuclear warheads.

The stationing of U.S. bombers, the newspaper notes, is intended to "placate the allies in Western Europe, who can see a threat to their security in the Soviet Union's proposal to remove all nuclear missiles from Europe." In addition to the B-52 issue, NATO military specialists are also studying "the possibility of increasing the number of other nuclear-capable military aircraft in Western Europe and the question of placing under NATO control the sea-based U.S. cruise missiles stationed on ships in the North Atlantic."

/6091

CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COLONEL ON WEST EUROPEAN ATTEMPTS TO 'BLOCK' AGREEMENT

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 6 May 87 pp 1-5

[Article by Col V. Dodonov under the rubric "News and Views": "Is the West Ready To Travel Its Part of the Road to a Nuclear-Free World?"]

[Text] The Soviet initiative for immediately concluding a separate agreement to remove Soviet and US medium-range missiles from Europe is in the focus of attention of governments and the international public. The USSR is also proposing that Soviet and US short-range missiles should also be simultaneously removed from Europe and that talks be held on such missiles in the east of our country and on United States territory. The Soviet side agrees to consider and solve the question of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, including tactical missiles, at separate multilateral talks in accordance with the Budapest initiative of the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty members. Many European countries have spoken in favour of the solution of the problem of medium-range missiles.

However, in order to impede the elaboration of an agreement, the rightwing conservatives and warhawks in the US administration and the governments of a number of NATO states are continuing to "link" this problem to other issues. The larger-scale Soviet initiatives become, the more these people are trying to distort their essence, play them down and in the end reject them on some or other pretext. US House of Representatives Armed Forces Committee chairman Les Aspin has openly declared that "the project for a step-by-step abolition of some kinds of nuclear weaponry is not a very wise thing."

These circles are searching the Soviet proposals for an ulterior motive and bringing unwarranted charges against the USSR of wanting to achieve a "stronger position" in relation to Western Europe. "Today everything looks just as if Western countries' leaders are being frightened by their own earlier proposals on disarmament," wrote the West German Westfälische Rundschau recently. As we can see, some people in the West have no eagerness to reach agreement on the abolition of nuclear missiles and at the same time do not know what to do to force the USSR to give up its disarmament proposals.

Any identification of the "threat" to Western security is being substantiated in a very simple way. The abolition of medium-range missiles, they say, would place the West before a Soviet "superiority" in short-range nuclear missiles.

The abolition of the latter in turn would lead to a Warsaw Treaty supremacy in conventional arms. A curtailment of the conventional arms would land the NATO states in a geostrategically disadvantageous position, which must also be eliminated and so forth. This suggests that NATO has no idea of its own about how to remove the nuclear missiles from Europe and cut the conventional arms; there is only "fear of disarmament." Even some Western leaders have been compelled to acknowledge this.

The FRG defence ministry is openly nurturing plans that torpedo the Soviet-American talks. In May the federal security council is going to discuss a programme for the nuclear modernization of the Bundeswehr. They want to replace Lance missiles with a new army tactical missile system with a nuclear warhead (range of up to 320 kilometres). The available 72 Pershing-IA missiles would be replaced with Pershing-IBs (range of up to 1,000 km). It is to be noted that Pershing-IB represents a changed-design, without the second stage, Pershing-2 missile. The question is being raised of "defensive" arms - of deploying antimissile systems. In short, Bonn sees no end to the arms race.

The FRG war department does not at all want the full dismantling of US Pershing-2s and Cruises, and is negatively looking on the Soviet proposals concerning 500-1,000-km-range missiles. According to a *Stuttgarter Zeitung* report, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU Parliamentary Party Volker Ruehe is also against the "zero-zero option," since it supposedly does not meet the security interests of West Germany and the FRG should approve reduction to zero in the medium- and short-range field only if the relevant agreement does not affect its Pershing-IA missiles. Ruehe went even so far as to claim that missile re-armament is not an alternative to the "zero option."

Paris and London are also supporting US attempts to block the turning of Europe into a nuclear-free continent. Here the aim is but one - to preserve their own nuclear arsenals. For in the even of agreement on medium-range missiles it'll be harder for France and Britain to justify the existence of their "independent" strike nuclear forces. Hence the negative attitude of the heads of government of these countries to the Soviet proposals to scrap European medium-range nuclear missiles. To any, even least informed person it is clear that the French and British missiles and other nuclear delivery vehicles will be used in the general system of NATO. They represent a formidable force and cannot be ignored.

The British nuclear force consists of 4 atomic submarines with 64 launchers of Polaris A-3TK ballistic missiles (six nuclear warheads per missile), and over 200 nuclear-armed tactical aircraft. France has on its 6 atomic missile submarines 96 launchers for M-20 ballistic missiles (with 1 warhead) and M-4s (with six warheads); 16 silo launchers with one-warhead ground-based S-3 ballistic missiles; up to 30 Mirage IVA-type strategic bombers armed with nuclear bombs and air-to-surface missiles; over 70 nuclear capable planes of tactical strike aviation; and about 40 launchers of Pluto short-range missiles.

The nuclear forces of these states continue to be improved and augmented. Thus, new British missile submarines in the early '90s will be equipped with US Trident-2 ballistic missiles. France is developing new ground-based

strategic missiles (S-4) and sea-based MIRVed M-5s, as well as the short-range Hades missile.

The just-adopted French National Assembly unprecedented five-year programme for a buildup of nuclear, chemical and conventional arms is a continuation of the line that seeks to raise the level of military confrontation and to fan up tension on the European continent. As though there weren't the numerous Soviet proposals on disarmament, the French *Le Monde*, wishing to prove the unprovable, at the same time even declares that "the USSR is the only potential aggressor."

Advocating the concept of nuclear "containment" and "deterrence," the Prime Minister of France is calling for not yielding to the "temptation" of a full nuclear disarmament of Europe. "It is the existence of nuclear forces that has enabled maintaining peace in Europe since 1945," asserts Jacques Chirac.

In this era security cannot be based on nuclear deterrence or other varieties of power politics. Such a policy condemns mankind to the risk of self-destruction. The willingness of the Soviet Union to look for solutions and compromises mirrors not a weakness or the assumption that it fears somebody. It's a demonstration of new political thinking in the nuclear age, a demonstration of the peaceloving nature of socialism and its sincere devotion to peace. Those who think that the USSR could be pressured to make even political concessions are deeply mistaken. It is high time for these Western circles to realize that talking to the USSR from a position of strength is a futile undertaking. It will never make concessions jeopardising the security of the country or its allies and will never give up its principles.

The Soviet position on abolishing nuclear missiles in Europe is not designed to obtain unilateral advantages; the legitimate interest of the Western partners have been taken into account. Therefore the Soviet side in turn has every reason to count on reciprocity, on the fact that the West will travel its part of the road to nuclear disarmament. It is time, at long last, to promote the freeing of Europe from nuclear missiles where the first, and therefore extremely important, step would be an agreement to eliminate Soviet and US medium-range missiles. (APN, May 5. In full.)

/13046
CSO: 5200/1484

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW CRITIQUES FRG, FRENCH, U.S. INF ATTITUDES

LD101920 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 10 May 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with TASS political observer Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI commentator Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, and All-Union Radio commentator Igor Pavlovich Charikov]

[Excerpts] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades. We would like to begin today's discussion with the event that was marked yesterday by our country's people, the people of the rest of Europe and, indeed, the people of the whole world: The 42d anniversary of the defeat of Hitlerite fascism, a date inscribed forever in the history of many states. With the years, the significance of that event becomes ever more palpable and ever more important; with every year that passes, we feel more and more concretely and more and more tangibly how that event is linked with the present.

[Grigoryev] When we talk and think about the past, we also have to think, of course, of today and of the contribution by both Germanies to ensuring that war never again comes to the world from German soil, and indeed that there are no more wars at all, either in Europe or in the world. I have already mentioned the GDR. One may recall the many peace proposals that have originated in the GDR, from the GDR itself as well as from other socialist countries. The West German leaders also have much to say: We hear many statements from them that war must not come from German soil and that the FRG has a very great interest in preserving peace. But unfortunately, often when you hear words, you begin to think of deeds; and nothing much has been done.

[Tsoppi] Now the moment of truth has come, when we have a chance to rid Europe of nuclear weapons, and here is where the West German position reveals itself.

[Grigoryev] Here it is unfortunately all too clear. The FRG is the only country in Western Europe where U.S. Pershing-2 medium-range missiles are sited, as well as practically the overwhelming majority of the cruise missiles. Well, it is the United States that has deployed [razmestit] these weapons. They are U.S. weapons, but nonetheless, all this has been done with the West German Government's consent.

Now a chance has been offered in our proposals made by Comrade Gorbachev: to destroy medium-range missiles in Europe, all of them; to destroy cruise missiles. We will speak later about the U.S. reaction, but what of the FRG's reaction, above all, of its

government, the ruling party, Chancellor Kohl? He has repeatedly -- and recently -- said that official Bonn is in favor of removing medium-range missiles from Europe.

As for the operational and tactical missiles, which we have also proposed removing, here Bonn's position becomes vague, like a blurred photograph. Then what? Then follows talk, from very senior people, too, that U.S. nuclear weapons should not be withdrawn from the FRG at all, because -- and here I quote Defense Minister Woerner -- the Warsaw Pact has three times the conventional weapons of the unfortunate West. They strike up the old tune. At one time they were saying: Accept President Reagan's zero option. I remember taking part in so many television discussions on this subject, at which my Western colleagues bombarded me with the question: Well why do you not accept the zero option? We accepted the zero option; more than that, we went further and proposed removing the operational and tactical missiles. But no: again, this is being hemmed in with all sorts of reservations. The Federal Republic is trying with every possible means to put off this decision and drown it in interminable discussion. I am talking now of the ruling parties, and actually even of the third coalition, because the Free Democrats, to give them their due, are taking a realistic attitude. The Social Democrats support the Soviet proposals even more actively. Well, they are an opposition party like the Greens. Naturally, innumerable public organizations and the German Communist Party, advocate solving this problem as quickly as possible.

Well, when you read the press, listen to the radio, and meet FRG representatives who come to Moscow, you see how strong, after all, are the forces on which the decision depends.

I mentioned Defense Minister Woerner; then there is the Chairman of the Parliamentary CDU [Christian Democratic Union] Dragger, and a lot of other figures in West Germany, and not only there, but in NATO, too: General Rogers, who is also sounding the alarm and shouting that Europe must on no account be deprived of this nuclear umbrella or whatever you like to call it -- shield, umbrella, or whatever -- though in fact it is a spear, again, appealing to and tying up with this problem, the question of conventional armaments, and so on, and so on.

[Charikov] In one way or another, we are getting nowhere in solving the question. Having received our latest proposal, the United States said in reply that they will give us their answer only after very thorough consultations with their allies. One of the major allies, the FRG, in the person of the Kohl government, seems to be answering negatively, as I understand it.

[Tsoppi] Or at least has not yet given a positive answer.

[Charikov] Has not given a positive answer. And the French?

[Tsoppi] Yes. I get the general impression that today, roles are being distributed like this: The Soviet Union and the United States are conducting negotiations in Geneva, elucidating their positions, seeking approaches that will be mutually acceptable to each other; meanwhile, U.S. NATO allies have been allocated the role, as it were, of inhibiting centers. Of course, it is all in the sphere of demagogic -- all this about the United States being obliged to consult their allies about everything before they can make a decision that concerns the whole of the free world. We know plenty of examples from history where there were no consultations at all and the United States simply told Western Europe what to do.

[Charikov] Incidentally, when George Shultz brought out this phrase at his news conference -- he said: We will go to Brussels and consult our allies about our answer; We are members of the Atlantic Alliance -- a sort of ironic whisper went around the hall.

[Tsoppi] Yes. So this common decision of the whole bloc, as it were, naturally depends not only on West Germany but also on the other NATO allies. I personally find the French position very worrying. The position of France -- which, as you know, has not been a member of the NATO military organization since the time of General de Gaulle and which does not have one foreign missile on its territory and makes do with its own nuclear missiles -- here we have it today, in effect occupying a position if not of obstruction then at least of very stubborn opposition, I would say, to what may happen in Europe as a result of the destruction even of just these two classes of nuclear missiles.

I think the next few days will bring further indications or information of some kind about the nature of the French position, because French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac will begin his visit to Moscow. He has made quite a few statements on the subject we are talking about, but I would like to draw attention to one he made 1 or 2 days ago: He said that since Peter the Great, the aim of the Russians has been to disarm Europe. At first I thought, how right he is, this is a very true observation. Just 270 years ago in May of 1717 Peter I, began in Paris the negotiations that ended in the signing of the treaty between Russia, France, and Prussia in August that same year, in Amsterdam. For various reasons that existed at the time, the monarchs did not succeed in forming a real alliance. But, France and Russia then declared quite definitely that they were entering into friendly relations and had undertaken to act jointly for the sake of achieving a general calm in Europe. Well, that is precisely what is called, in today's language, European security. But then I thought that there was more than met the eye in this historical excursus by the French prime minister.

After all, official Paris today gives the words European disarmament a completely different meaning. Every day, at all levels and in every key, they are saying in France that the Soviet Union now intends to disarm [obezoruzhit] Western Europe. You will detect the difference: Not to achieve disarmament throughout Europe [razoruzhit], but to disarm [obrezoruzhit] Western Europe -- strip it of its arms, render it defenseless, make it absolutely weak in the face of...

[Charikov, interrupting] In other words, gain military superiority.

[Tsoppi] Gain military superiority.

[Charikov] It is not our term.

[Tsoppi] That superiority -- they speak of superiority in conventional arms including armored divisions and so on -- can be offset only by nuclear weapons, in the opinion of the politicians in Paris. A false concept is being deliberately substituted for a real one, and that spurious substitution rehabilitates in advance, as it were, all actions directed against delivering the whole of Europe -- not just Western Europe and not just Eastern Europe -- from nuclear weapons; all actions directed against a general calm in Europe. Today these maneuvers form a contrast -- to put it mildly -- against the background of real and increasingly substantial positive changes in international politics, with the ideas of fighting for a nuclear-free Europe ceasing to be utopian, ceasing to be a matter of pious intentions, and beginning to take on the flesh and bones of reality.

This is indeed understood by very many people in Europe today. But Paris says no: No, we do not need that; we shall display double vigilance in regard to all the Soviet proposals. At a very high level -- I am thinking of French Foreign Affairs Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond -- they are saying how surprising it is that in the West, not only the public but also official circles believe that Gorbachev is blazing completely new trails. Here we can see their assumed skepticism, a skepticism that dictates their stance, for the French Government has already completely disavowed its support for the zero option, although it was its most ardent advocate when the United States put it forward. At that time, both the French president and the French Government supported that very zero option, but now that this zero has become attainable, has turned out to be within the realm of possibility, so to speak, for some reason it is no longer in line with the interests of France and universal peace.

The following formula is now dominant: We are for nuclear deterrence and for the U.S. nuclear presence on European soil. In my view, this stance is a fairly irresponsible one, and I do not think I am being overly harsh here. It is irresponsible because it is not a matter of French territory, but rather of that of other Western European countries, and to speak out so categorically for continuing, for intensifying, and for augmenting the nuclear threat to the whole of Europe today, in my view, ill becomes France, which has done so much for Europe's glory and grandeur, and which fought alongside the allies in World War II, in the war against Hitlerism.

In this connection, I would like to say a few words in general about our relations with France. When Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the French Communist Party, [PCF] met in Moscow on 4 May, it was not simply a conversation between like-minded comrades who had simply come together to confirm their stance. It was an exchange of views between the leaders of two parties acting in totally different historical conditions and tackling different tasks, an exchange of views that turned out to be very fruitful. The main conclusion from their dialogue is as follows:

The CPSU and the PCF feel that objective conditions exist in the world for creating a powerful and effective coalition of all peace-loving forces, which would be capable of creating a barrier to the nuclear threat and of ensuring mankind's survival.

Both parties are acting robustly in this area; our parties are in favor of continuing and developing Soviet-French dialogue, that is essential. It is all the more essential at a time when such considerable, profound, and acute differences are appearing on issues of war and peace, on issues of European security or -- to use a term from the time of Peter the Great -- on issues of general quiet in Europe. I would make an addition to this term: happy, tranquil, peaceful general quiet in Europe.

[Charikov] I would like to return to the following aspect of the problem of nuclear missile weaponry: What we are seeing is not only an unwillingness on the part of the U.S. Administration to find some kind of compromise on medium-range missiles, but in addition a striving to somehow guarantee itself -- let us say by illegal means -- superiority in strategic arms. We are perfectly well aware that since 1979, the SALT II treaty has been in existence. Though that treaty was never ratified by the U.S. Senate, there is, nevertheless, an accord on adherence to it.

Incidentally, since 1979, in the U.S. Congress -- both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, incidentally -- speeches have been made supporting adherence to that treaty because the Reagan administration, which came to power not long after the treaty was signed, showed an implacable and indomitable desire to somehow, if not formally

abrogate that treaty, then at least overstep its threshold. From time to time, U.S. congressmen have expressed their interest in seeing the administration observe the treaty, in seeing the strategic arms framework and...well, limits remain unshakeable. So, in November of last year, as we recall, the U.S. Administration armed the Air Force with a B-52 bomber with cruise missiles on board, which was the first unit of strategic nuclear arms in excess of that limit. Since then, these violations have been continuing, and both Reagan and his closest colleagues have been stating for all to hear that they no longer consider themselves bound by that agreement.

I think this expresses in general a certain -- how can I put it -- improbity on the part of the U.S. Administration in its conduct of international affairs, an improbity that has been fairly perceptible in the past few years, and irresponsibility as well, alongside which...

[Charikov, interrupting] Immorality.

[Tsoppi] Yes, precisely, immorality, alongside which they are constantly moralizing to all of mankind.

[Charikov] Yes. This now gives us the opportunity to move on to the subject of Irangate. But, all the same, I would like to dwell further on SALT II, particularly since there is something to be said here. The fact that the U.S. legislators are, I would say, consistently -- in one can put it that way and fairly seriously, to judge by the voting results, advocating adherence to the treaty and refusing the administration new funds for financing arms exceeding the framework of the SALT II treaty, if we take into account these persistent actions, then we can imagine just how strong the opposition is to this adventurism, this immorality, this improbity in U.S. foreign policy, in that of the current administration, I mean.

Now and again questions crop up -- often in letters -- as to whether the U.S. legislators have gained a certain political insight and whether they have reached a point at which things have become clear to them that were not clear before.

How does one answer this question? In my view, there is no straightforward answer. One can only say that certain kinds of processes of reinterpretation of political realities are indeed taking place in Washington. That is a fact. As to how fast they will take place, we cannot yet say, because the United States is a complex country and a very great deal depends on short-term considerations: the election campaign and everything else, perhaps even on flare-ups of local tension, etc. Nonetheless, one can note with certainty that this process has begun. In the present context, I do not want to use the words new political thinking in reference to U.S. Congressmen...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Let us say slightly renewed.

[Charikov] I would not even say renewed, but rather a political thinking that takes into account the new realities. So, that is the expression I would use in answer to the question radio listeners ask us in their letters and that often crops up in the foreign press.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

IZVESTIYA VIEWS CHIRAC-KOHL TALKS ON INF, SRINF

PM071535 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "France-FRG: Meeting in Strasbourg"]

[Text] Paris -- French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl have met in the French city of Strasbourg, where they examined Soviet proposals on eliminating medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe.

According to press reports, Chirac and Kohl stated the need to study carefully the Soviet initiatives and hold joint consultations before a common position is formulated by the West European countries. It is proposed that these will take place at the end of May.

The French prime minister said that his government has "great reservations" about the series of "zero options" (that is, the elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles -- Yu.K.), which, in his words, involve a risk of Europe being left without nuclear weapons. Observers point out that Paris and Bonn continue to think that peace in Europe will be secured by means of nuclear deterrence so long as the Soviet Union possesses alleged superiority in the conventional armed forces and armaments area. Moreover, in their opinion, the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons will help U.S. European unity.

There are, however, differences in the French and FRG attitudes to the Soviet proposals. Jacques Chirac reiterated that the consistent reduction of nuclear arsenals involves a threat to peace and declining security on the continent of Europe. For his part, the chancellor of the FRG, a country where 92 percent of the population favors the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, expressed the conviction that the West Europeans will manage to find a general solution guaranteeing greater security with fewer weapons.

Commenting on the results of the Strasbourg meeting, L'HUMANITE writes: "While the old continent has been turned over the years into a real powder keg capable of destroying the whole of European civilization, French officialdom regards the elimination of U.S. and Soviet missiles as a 'threat' and even as a 'nuclear Munich.' In these conditions," L'HUMANITE continues, the question arises: Why is the French prime minister going to Moscow?

/6091
CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S VORONTSOV VISITS FRG, DISCUSSES GENEVA TALKS

Sees Genscher, Teltschik, Bahr

LD061853 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 6 May 87

[Text] Bonn May 6 TASS -- USSR first deputy foreign minister, head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms Yuliy Vorontsov met today in Bonn with FRG Minister for Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher and head of the foreign policy department of the office of the federal chancellor, Horst Teltschik. Yuliy Vorontsov informed them of the stand of the USSR and the state of affairs at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva in connection with the opening of the eighth round. Yuliy Vorontsov also had a conversation with member of the board and the presidium of the board of the social democratic party of Germany, chairman of the Bundestag arms control and disarmament sub-committee Egon Bahr.

At a news conference held at the USSR Embassy in the FRG Yuliy Vorontsov answered numerous questions of local and foreign journalists mainly about the new Soviet proposals on disarmament, including the elimination of USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, and on shorter range-missiles.

Further Details

LD062004 Hamburg DPA in German 1803 GMT 6 May 87

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA) -- According to Yuliy Vorontsov, chief Soviet negotiator at the disarmament negotiations in Geneva, the Soviet Government is "firmly convinced" that it will be able to sign a treaty with the United States on a zero option for longer-range INF missiles this year.

Vorontsov, who is also first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, said at a news conference in Bonn today that for his government the zero option for the longer range INF systems is the "main goal." If they succeed at the same time in negotiating a zero solution for the shorter-range INF missiles "this would please us." But it is in no way a condition.

Vorontsov returned to Geneva this evening and, with the remark to the Bonn correspondents that he had briefed them to the same extent as he had his official partners in the talks, left behind an impression of unusual openness.

The two draft treaties of the superpowers in Geneva on the longer-range INF solution lie close together "and can also be fully coordinated," Vorontsov said. He gave examples of the still open verification questions. The United States believes that verification of a halt to production and its continued observance is adequate from "outside the factory gate." The Soviets want verification in the factories.

Moscow wants to make the scrapping a media event. Vorontsov announced invitations to the Bonn correspondents for early 1988 to watch the scrapping of the SS-20 missiles, because "the world has not yet experienced the start of the destruction of nuclear weapons."

In the cases of the old "German" Pershings, the Soviets are only interested in the nuclear warheads. Vorontsov made it clear that the nuclear arming comes under U.S. great power responsibility and is thus also part of what is being negotiated on in Geneva. The 72 type 1-A rockets themselves and their launch ramps, which are in the possession of the Bundeswehr, are, like any possible conventional warheads, of no interest to Moscow, he said.

The Soviet chief negotiator, one of Moscow's most respected diplomats, also expressed the opinion that it would be possible to sign the longer-range INF zero option, under which 100 missiles would remain on each side outside Europe, by September, or October at the latest. The U.S. side also believes this; Autumn is the last date for achieving ratification by summer 1988, because otherwise the U.S. presidential election campaign and the installation of a new government in 1989 would postpone disarmament by at least 2 years. The Soviet diplomat thus agrees with the timescale generally accepted in the West.

Vorontsov reaffirmed Moscow's interest in conventional disarmament and accused the West of negotiating too hesitantly in Vienna on a mandate for this. On the longer-range INF zero option the chief negotiator said that the principal clauses of the treaty have been in existence since the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik in October 1986. In Geneva it is only a matter of filling them in technically.

When the question of an agreement on the shorter-range INF missiles comes up he hopes that the Federal Government's final stance will be "put forward with one voice." Here, however, he also made clear Moscow's opinion that the two superpowers could find a basis for understanding relatively easily. Here the same scheme could be applied as in the longer-range INF sphere, with a remaining stock of missiles with equal, global upper limits.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1483

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: REACTION TO 7 MAY KOHL 'INTERIM' STATEMENT

'Evaded' Response to USSR

LD070951 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 7 May 87

[Text] Bonn May 7 TASS -- TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Vladimir Smelov report:

West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who made a government statement on disarmament problems today, did not formulate in it Bonn's final position on Soviet proposals for eliminating medium-range and theater missiles from Europe.

He explained that in his statement he had only summed up the "intermediate results" of debates on disarmament.

While calling for a "global zero solution" for the medium-range missiles, Kohl at the same time voiced opposition to abolishing this class of missiles in Europe on the pretext that this would "complicate verification of the disarmament process".

The West German head of government effectively evaded giving a response to the Soviet proposal for eliminating also theater missiles from Europe.

While claiming he shared the Soviet view on the need for new thinking, he nevertheless talked once again about the importance of nuclear weapons to ensure the security of the West and repeated untenable allegations about a "Soviet military advantages".

Kohl 'Contradicted Himself'

LD081303 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 8 May 87

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Aleksey Sokolov]

[Excerpt] FRG Chancellor Kohl yesterday submitted a government statement on disarmament issues in which he stated that he shares the USSR's viewpoint on the necessity for new thinking and new actions. Has the ice melted? Well, it does not look like it. The chancellor contradicted himself. He once again spoke of the strategy of deterrence, and of the importance of nuclear weapons which, he said, NATO cannot totally renounce.

In his attempts to justify this policy of his government, Kohl once again exaggerated the insolvent theses about a considerable Soviet military superiority and the capability of the Warsaw Pact to invade West Europe.

Kohl did not set out Bonn's final stance with regard to the Soviet proposal to eliminate medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe.

In the chancellor's words he set out in his statement only the interim result of the discussions on disarmament.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1483

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S FALIN INTERVIEWED ON BONN'S DISARMAMENT STANCE

LD072124 Hamburg DPA in German 2115 GMT 7 May 87

[Text] Moscow (DPA) -- According to Valentin Falin, the Soviet expert on Germany and head of the official news agency NOVOSTI, the Bonn government's statement on disarmament does not meet the expectations of the Soviet Union. In an interview with DPA in Moscow, Falin made clear criticism of the statement by Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who approved a zero solution for medium-range missiles of longer range (1,000-5,000 km) but reserved his decision on medium-range missiles of shorter range (500-1,00 km)

"We at least expected that the federal republic would support the concept of removing medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles with nuclear warheads from Europe in order to strengthen joint security and open the way for a radical, qualitative disarmament in all other significant area," Falin said.

However, the chancellor was not prepared to do this. He said that NATO could not do without nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future. The government statement is inconsistent in its premises and its conclusions. Falin described the conventional superiority of the East stressed by Kohl as "artificial." "If the French and Spanish weapons are added in, there no longer is any superiority." Moreover, Moscow has more than once made proposals for conventional disarmament, which so far have not been answered by the West.

Falin went on to say that the problem of the Pershing 1A missiles in possession of the Bundeswehr, which can be fitted with U.S. nuclear warheads, is a "very primary question." Bonn obviously does not want to include these systems in a solution on the shorter-range medium-range missiles. Falin said, however, that this is a problem because the United States of America is carrying out "double bookkeeping" and counting sometimes carrier systems, sometimes warheads on weapon systems entirely as they like. He stressed, however, that in the case of the Pershing 1A's the Soviet Union is only concerned about the nuclear warheads. "Please keep these missiles in your arsenal, if they have such significance for the federal republic, but without nuclear warheads; otherwise there will come into being a...fifth nuclear power in Europe."

Falin accused the federal government of wanting to avoid a clear position by wishing to wait until the submission of a Soviet draft treaty before making a decision on the shorter-range medium-range missiles. At the same time, the NOVOSTI head said that in his opinion an interim solution is also possible. The best solution is the immediate elimination of this weapon category. However, if this is not possible, one could also consider a gradual solution in two or three stages.

The federal republic has a primary role in solving the existing problems, because it is on its soil that the main elements of the U.S. medium-range missiles potential are stationed. Apart from sharp criticism, Falin noted positively that Kohl said the security of the federal republic should be based more strongly on coexistence [miteinander] than on confrontation [gegeneinander].

The visit to the USSR by President Richard von Weizsaecker, announced for 6-11 July, will provide the opportunity to speak about many things calmly, and in an objective and balanced way. The former ambassador to Bonn said he hoped the visit will lead to better understanding and an unprejudiced assessment of the wishes and aims of both sides. One will then be able to look with greater confidence to the future. "I want that, and for that reason I wish the visit success."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1483

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON GENSCHER MAY TALKS IN WASHINGTON

'No Unanimity in Bonn'

LD111948 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 11 May 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpts] The further improvement of the Atlantic military machine is continuing. Major new NATO Armed Forces exercises have begun in Italy. In a lengthy article published in the latest issue of NEWSWEEK, the NATO commander in chief, U.S. General Rogers, calls for nuclear weapons capable of reaching the heart of the Soviet Union -- as he put it -- to be maintained in Europe. [video shows picture of Rogers and article entitled "What's Wrong With 'Zero', NATO's Boss Speaks Out".] The only consolation is that, as has been officially announced, this summer this most aggressive general is to retire from his NATO command post.

Another encouraging thing is that the antinuclear movement is stepping up its activity in many NATO countries. Meanwhile, FRG Foreign Minister Genscher is conducting negotiations with U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, Pentagon Chief Weinberger, and congressional leaders in Washington on the Soviet proposals for eliminating nuclear missiles in Europe. May I remind you, Comrades, that there is no unanimity on this issue in Bonn itself. The Free Democrat Party -- of which Genscher is one of the leaders -- takes a positive view of the Soviet proposals. The right wing of the Christian Democratic Union, however -- it is usually described as the steel helmet faction in Bonn -- opposes the elimination of nuclear weapons on the European Continent.

In his latest government statement, Chancellor Kohl did not take up any wholly definite position on this issue. On the one hand, he approves of the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe, but on the other hand, he advocates maintaining operational and tactical missiles here. The reason for such duality is not hard to understand, for the Bundeswehr itself is armed with the Pershing-I tactical missiles. Although the United States asserts that the nuclear warheads for these are under their control, the West German generals also keep their hands on the trigger.

'Half-Hearted, Vague Answer'

LD122108 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1618 GMT 12 May 87

[Igor Surguchev commentary on the "International Diary" program presented by Igor Charikov]

[Text] [Charikov] A 1-day working visit to the United States by FRG Foreign Affairs Minister Genscher has come to an end. He met President Reagan and held talks with Secretary of State Shultz, Defense Secretary Weinberger and the President's national security adviser, Carlucci. The main subject of Genscher's Washington discussions was the problem of eliminating medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. So, what distinguished the West German minister's visit and did it to clarify the West's attitudes to the Soviet proposals for liberating Europe from these types of nuclear weapons? Over to commentator Igor Surguchev.

[Surguchev] Unfortunately, using Remarque's words, it's all quiet on the western front. We could also formulate a somewhat simplified answer to the question: It is clear that nothing is clear. No statements for the press were published on the results of the visit, while the guest from the banks of the Rhine himself told journalists that his government had not yet adopted a decision toward the Soviet proposals. Genscher made it clear that Bonn's decision should correspond to the single position of the NATO countries which is still to be worked out. If we take into consideration his admission that even inside the FRG Government there exist differences over the approach to the USSR proposals, it would seem very likely that the process of coordinating positions within NATO will be a long one.

Of course, it's no use rushing serious matters. But one cannot fail to note that the Atlantic partners as a rule are significantly more efficient and united in their views when it is a question of increasing the bloc's military power or adopting new militarist plans. Now, when thanks to our country's initiatives a realistic possibility of taking an important step along the road of disarmament has appeared, the NATO camp displays indecisiveness, evasiveness, and almost outright timidity. One gets the impression that in the current situation, some West European leaders are behaving in the way prescribed by the somewhat forgotten children's counting rhyme:

Do not say yes and no,
Black with white doesn't go.

But the decisions concern an issue of enormous importance both for Europe and for the entire world. A half-hearted, vague answer to the Soviet proposals of the "Yes, but..." sort clearly does not suit the peoples striving for a lasting peace -- peace with a lesser quantity of weapons.

That kind of objective, by the way, was comparatively recently being proclaimed also by FRG Chancellor Kohl. But the Western statesmen are evidently not prepared to reinforce their fine rhetoric with concrete, practical steps, which is shown by their confusion in connection with the Soviet proposals, all the more strange since at the basis of these proposals lies NATO's zero option on medium-range missiles.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1483

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S KARPOV COMMENTS ON FRG APPROACH TO DISARMAMENT

DW140621 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 12 May 87 pp 1, 2

[Article by Moscow correspondent Werner Adam on a talk with USSR disarmament expert Viktor Karpov: "Moscow Presses Bonn To Make a Decision In the European Disarmament Quarrel"]

[Text] Moscow, 11 May -- Regarding the dispute about dismantling missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union urged the FRG on Monday "to play its own role in this responsible period." Top diplomat Karpov, who is responsible for arms control in the Moscow Foreign Ministry, confirmed in a talk with this newspaper that Bonn's attitude has remained unclear even after Chancellor Kohl's recent government statement. The Soviet Union now hopes that the Federal Government "will support in the very near future the necessity of achieving an agreement on abolishing Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles." Karpov commented on the chancellor's reservation that Bonn must expect from Moscow a written explanation of the Soviet position on the disputed problem of short range missiles. He said that in addition to Soviet Ambassador Kvitsinskiy, First Deputy Foreign Minister Vorontsov had informed the Federal Government "in detail" last week. Therefore, the question arises whether Kohl is demanding additional "special proposals or some such" from Moscow, concluded the Soviet disarmament expert disdainfully, adding anything but general criticism of the West.

Karpov took great pains to note that it was not the Soviet Union, but the United States that had raised the issue of linking efforts to achieve a zero solution for longer range intermediate-range missiles (LRINF) with negotiations on the problem of short-range missiles (SRINF). However, as soon as Moscow accepted that, the West reacted with new reservations to that "generous contribution" by the Soviet Union. The Eastern side sticks to its proposal "completely to abolish" short-range weapons as "a type of missile." Should the United States not insist any longer on a direct connection among missile systems of various ranges, the Soviet Union would be prepared to conclude for the present only an agreement on abolishing its SS-20 missiles and the U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe. Presupposing the "desire and will" of the leading Western power, agreement on signing such an agreement could be achieved "as early as in 2-3 months," said the main department chief for arms control and disarmament in the Moscow Foreign Ministry.

Even considering the possible verification problems Karpov did not want to accept reservations about the plan to have 100 nuclear warheads and SS-20 missiles remaining in the Asiatic part of the Soviet Union along with the simultaneous deployment of a similar number of weapons systems on U.S. territory.

By way of corroboration, he said that Moscow accepted in its treaty draft comprehensive verifications that should simultaneously guarantee the contractually agreed mobility limits of the missiles. Moreover, the Soviet Union does not at all have a geographic advantage, argued Karpov, because there is a similar transfer potential on the U.S. side, as has been sufficiently demonstrated by the transatlantic "big lift" maneuvers. In addition, Moscow is willing to talk about dismantling those missiles which, however, presupposes consideration of the U.S. military presence in the Asia-Pacific area. The Soviet expert mentioned in this connection especially the "infrastructure" the United States has created for missile deployment in South Korea, and the building of a U.S. air base for F-16 fighter-bombers in the north of Japan.

Apart from that, Karpov regretted that U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, during his recent visit to Moscow, had rejected the Soviet proposal to abolish completely the short-range missiles with a 500-1,000 km range, which would mean abolition of that weapons category. Instead, the United States now wants to change its Pershing-2 missiles, which are supposed to be scrapped -- according to the current state of the Geneva negotiations -- into Pershing-1b missiles with a shorter range so as to "maintain its missile presence in Europe under a different name." However, such plans are objectionable because of the fact that such a modification, in either direction, would take "no longer than 48 hours" according to U.S. research results. Moreover, the United States is also seeking to keep in Europe some of its cruise missiles that have no nuclear warheads, or to convert them into sea-based missiles. Moscow can only hope that the United States' Western European allies will not also act as "brakemen" on the road to reducing the number of LRINF missiles. They should now be particularly aware of "the dramatic and decisive role of the very moment", said Karpov, adding that Europe is now facing the question of "further accumulating weapons, or of overcoming narrow-minded and selfish expectations."

While discussing the topic, he broached the issue of the 72 Pershing-1A missiles, equipped with nuclear warheads under American lock and key that the Bundeswehr has. The Soviet Union "currently" does not require the Federal Republic to do without those missiles, Karpov stated. The issue implies the inclusion of those warheads in the disarmament program, because they are U.S. weapons in West German territory and because in the end all nuclear warheads on tactical missiles with a 500-1,000 km range should be removed. Referring to Kohl's support for NATO's nuclear strategy of "flexible response," which Kohl advocates in this very context, Karpov reproached the federal chancellor for attributing aggressive intentions to the Soviet Union, even though it is a "myth." Soviet military doctrine is distinguished by a "clearly pronounced defensive character," the arms control expert maintained. Moreover, the Warsaw Pact states are prepared to initiate special negotiations with NATO on the discussion about the respective military doctrine and to do so for the purpose of orienting those doctrines to the "maintenance of peace."

Therefore the Soviet Union does not just advocate the reduction of missiles, but also the elimination of the "most dangerous conventional offensive weapons," Karpov went on to say, and urged "spurring on the Vienna MBFR talks about mutual force reductions in Europe," which had fallen into a "torpor." Karpov emphasized that it is high time to decide on a new negotiation mandate for the reduction of troops and weapons in Europe before the Vienna CSCE follow-up conference is over. The Soviet side is of the opinion that the Stockholm CDE conference on confidence-building and disarmament could be entrusted with such a mandate, but it could also become a negotiation issue at a "special forum" or within an "extended MBFR framework." Referring to the latest speculation about the alleged intention of Soviet party chief Gorbachev to propose the

withdrawal of all foreign troops from the European countries at the forthcoming Warsaw Pact member states summit meeting in East Berlin, Karpov only said that he was "not informed" about it. However, the Soviet Union had "always advocated measures to reduce tensions in central Europe, where foreign troops are stationed." The proposal made by the GDR and Czechoslovakia to establish a nuclear-free zone in central Europe "without warheads and carriers" could serve that purpose. On such a basis, further steps could be discussed "to deprive both alliances of the opportunity to start offensive operations," Karpov concluded. He gave assurances that regarding the missiles issue and other arms control problems, Moscow will "always be open for talks if the Federal Government wishes additional information."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1483

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS CITES GENSCHER: NO FRG DECISION ON SOVIET PROPOSAL

LD120602 Moscow TASS in English 0551 GMT 12 May 87

[Text] Washington May 12 TASS -- West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who is staying in the United States on a one-day working visit, told newsmen here that the government of his country had not yet taken a decision on a Soviet proposal for eliminating medium-range and theater nuclear missiles from Europe.

He made it clear that there were disagreements about the problem in the West German Government.

The issue was also in the center of discussions Genscher had with U.S. administration officials.

During his visit the West German foreign minister had an unscheduled meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan. He also conferred with State Secretary George Shultz, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and Frank Carlucci, assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

No statements for the press were issued on the results of the visit. Genscher also declined to give a press conference, limiting himself to a briefing for correspondents from West Germany.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1483

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: FRENCH CP LEADER VISITS, DISCUSSES INF, FRENCH ARMS PLANS

Interviewed in Yerevan

LD301153 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 30 Apr 87

[Excerpts] Yerevan April 30 TASS--The French Communists and all progressive people are following with much attention and interest the revolutionary reforms in the USSR and are expressing confidence that the Soviet people will cope with the aims they set to themselves, a TASS correspondent was told by Georges Marchais, general secretary of the French Communist Party. He is currently on a tour of the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

Touching upon new political thinking in international affairs, in particular on disarmament problems, elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe, Georges Marchais stressed that the French Communists fully support the latest proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev and declare for an end to nuclear tests, elimination of chemical weapons, for non-militarization of outer space, a cut in military spendings and France's active participation in all disarmament talks.

The Communists declare against the policy of rearmament and insist that the French Government should make a real contribution to balanced nuclear disarmament, contribute to the elimination of all nuclear forces by the year 2000.

Touching upon the relations between the French Communist Party and the CPSU, the French Communist leader described them as close and fruitful, and added that they would further steadily develop and be increasingly enriched.

Holds Talks With Gorbachev

LD051337 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1214 GMT 5 May 87

[Quotation marks as received]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 5 May (TASS) -- There was a meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and G. Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party [PCF] on Monday, 4 May.

"Soviet Communists, said M.S. Gorbachev, feel great affinity for the struggle of their French comrades in defense of the interests of working people, for peace and social progress, liberty and socialism. In the contemporary complex situation the CPSU and the PCF are like true comrades-in-arms in the struggle against the threat of nuclear war, for security and disarmament, and against the aggressive policy of international imperialism.

M.S. Gorbachev and G. Marchais noted that since their previous meeting in September 1985 there have been major changes for the better in the world which exercise a profound and lasting influence on all social development. The atmosphere of international life is changing. Various social and political forces, professional and religious organizations, and outstanding cultural figures are demanding more and more decisively the prevention of a nuclear apocalypse, safeguarding lasting peace, universal security, and mutually advantageous peaceful cooperation between peoples. The ideas of struggle for a nuclear free world, to save civilization and life on earth, are becoming a leitmotif in consciousness which is common to all mankind.

This important new historical reality is the result of the program put forward by the USSR for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, which was given concrete expression recently in the Soviet proposals for the complete elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe.

For the first time the real prospect has been opened up of destroying a whole class of nuclear missile weapons. The USSR proposals have become the expression of a new interpretation of the problems of world development with the object of ensuring the future of the human race.

During the meeting it was noted that confrontation between the forces of peace and the forces of reaction and war is getting more and more intensive and strained with each day. The United States is essentially revising the mutual understanding that was achieved in Reykjavik and is continuing its Star Wars program. The need to strengthen further the potential of the healthy forces of mankind -- the forces of reason and of peace -- is increasing.

Georges Marchais noted that the PCF was the only party in France which struggled resolutely against the adoption of and voted against the adoption of the bill on the military program sent for the approval of the National assembly with the common consent of the president of the Republic and the government.

French Communists are consistent defenders of the independence and sovereignty of their country. In particular they advocate an effective policy of national defense and have put forward corresponding proposals. At the same time the security of the country also depends today at least to an equal extent on political factors and on the desire to act for peace and disarmament. The law on the military program ignores these demands and brings France into increasingly participating in the senseless arms race. Indeed, this law envisages a considerable increase in military expenditure; the production, development [razrabotka] and creation [sozdaniye] of nuclear and space arms, and neutron and chemical weapons; and the continuation of nuclear tests on Mururoa. This policy is being implemented despite the behest of the times and goes against the unprecedented possibilities opening up thanks to the USSR proposals and measures directed at nuclear disarmament, the elimination of chemical weapons, and the reduction of conventional arms.

In these conditions, the PCF is stepping up its efforts for unity among Frenchmen in the struggle for peace and against the threats to the very existence of modern civilization being created by imperialism; its struggle for France to promote the conclusion of treaties on balanced and verifiable [kontroliruyemnyj] disarmament, and on the elimination of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

The tasks and the responsibility of campaigners for the future of mankind are becoming increasingly significant and the range of their concerns increasingly wide. Ensuring peace presupposes not only a halt in the arms race and real disarmament measures, but also the reorganization of the whole system of international relations.

Hundreds of millions of deprived people -- men, women, and children -- live in the countries of the Third World. The fantastic sums swallowed up by the death-dealing nuclear arms race ought to be used to combat hunger and solve the problems of the developing countries.

Peace and development are closely interconnected, and are at the focus of the demands for a new international economic order based on justice, democracy, cooperation, and independence.

The CPSU and PCF consider that objective conditions exist in the world for the creation of a powerful and effective coalition of all peace-loving forces, capable of creating a barrier to the nuclear threat and of guaranteeing the survival of mankind.

In achieving this aim, a big role should be played by the communist parties, by their constructive efforts and their active participation in the antiwar movement, in dialogue and cooperation with the most varied forces which are ready for this.

Taking this into account, the importance of the free and equal cooperation of communists of all continents is enhanced. The forms of this cooperation -- bilateral and multilateral -- can and should be varied and out of the ordinary and be in line with both the national interests of each fraternal party and the common interests of communists throughout the whole world.

M.S. Gorbachev and G. Marchais spoke in favor of staging a major joint meeting of all the different forces in Europe which advocate disarmament, to which end the PCF is making great efforts along with other parties.

CPSU Central Committee secretary A.F. Dobrynin; members of the CPSU Central Committee V.V. Zagladin and A.S. Chernyayev; and members of the Politburo and secretaries of the PCF Central Committee A. Lajoinie and M. Gremetz; and member of the PCF Central Committee J.F. Gau took part in the meeting.

TASS Interview

PM111457 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Profound Democratization. Interview With G. Marchais"]

[Excerpts] Paris, 7 May--The entire Soviet Union is now a veritable construction site, Georges Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party [PCF], has declared. In an interview on TF-1, French television's channel 1, he spoke of his trip to the USSR and his meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The PCF delegation, G. Marchais went on to say, discussed three major topics with Soviet comrades: what is happening in the USSR, problems of peace and disarmament, and the interest in Franco-Soviet cooperation in all areas. The proposals advanced by the Soviet Union mean that mankind has been afforded an exceptional opportunity to totally eliminate nuclear weapons. Contrary to claims by French politicians, the Soviet proposals do not envisage the withdrawal of nuclear weapons just from Europe while preserving them in the United States and the USSR. That is a total lie. It was confirmed to me most categorically that the Soviet Union's aim is to achieve as quickly as possible, and in any case by the year 2000, the total destruction of nuclear weapons and, through talks on conventional arms, to achieve a distribution of forces in Europe and throughout the world which will guarantee the security of all states. But the Soviet Union wants to go much further. The contours of a world totally rid of arms are being outlined. The question of a new type of all-around cooperation among the peoples is being touched upon.

Soviet people, the PCF secretary general emphasized in conclusion, express great interest in the development of cooperation with France in all areas -- political, economic, cultural, scientific. Unfortunately -- and this is said not only by them but also, for example, by all foreign journalists without exception in Moscow -- it has to be stated that France's present policy is of a negative nature with regard to problems which have to be solved in order to advance along the path of disarmament.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1486

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG: KOHL MAKES GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON INF

DW070931 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 0700 GMT 7 May 87

[Statement by Chancellor Helmut Kohl before the Bundestag in Bonn--live]

[Text] Mr President, esteemed Ladies and gentlemen: The Federal Government welcomes the debate today on the state of the Geneva disarmament talks. It provides an opportunity to make an interim report, not only on the current superpower negotiations, but also on the intensive consultations by the European partners in the North Atlantic alliance. To begin with, let me briefly summarize the goals of the FRG's security policy. The highest goal of the FRG's security policy is and remains the preservation of peace in freedom. [applause]

Therefore, the security policy of the Federal Government and its allies is aimed at strengthening peace and preventing any kind of war, either nuclear or conventional. A war waged with modern conventional weapons would endanger our people and European civilization just as a nuclear war would.

Military conflicts between East and West have been prevented in the past 42 years. That is primarily attributable to the fact that we Germans and Europeans are not alone, but are allied with the free democracies of the West, in particular, the United States. It was for good reason that I paid tribute to that fact in my government statement to the Bundestag in March by saying that such cooperation — the partnership and alliance with the United States — is of vital importance to our country. We owe our peace and freedom to the fact that this defense alliance has pursued and will continue to pursue a successful policy.

We want to cooperate comprehensively with the Soviet Union and its allies, in particular in the field of disarmament and arms control, on the basis of a guaranteed defensive capacity. We consider that the only way to make cooperation rather than confrontation the basis of our security.

In recent months, we have achieved important progress. The meeting of the German-Soviet Economic Commission agreed to expand economic relations further and embark on new directions. In recent weeks, we signed three agreements to improve cooperation in agricultural research, health, and nuclear research. On that basis, the framework agreement on technological-scientific cooperation will become effective. As you know, additional mutual agreements and visits have been agreed upon.

I am also particularly pleased that Bulgarian head of state Todor Zhivkov has accepted my invitation and will come to the FRG for an official visit on 2 June. Our relations with the other Warsaw Pact members are also developing constructively and dynamically. Everyone must realize that we are doing well. However, all that must be conducted on the basis of a guaranteed defensive capacity.

What does that mean, ladies and gentlemen? Reviewing German and European history, and considering the theaters of war today, we see that not even the numerical equality of any given enemies is sufficient to prevent war unless the political desire prevails to rule out war in any circumstance as a extension of policy. The purpose of the flexible response and deterrent policy is to prevent war. That is possible if an attacker must expect a response that makes it clear to him from the start that launching an offensive to pursue his political goals constitutes an unacceptable risk.

Based on such considerations, our alliance has developed its proven strategy of flexible response. There is no alternative to that policy in the foreseeable future. For its effectiveness and credibility, balanced nuclear and conventional armed forces continue to be necessary. That is why our alliance cannot totally do without nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future.

We continue emphatically and consistently to advocate disarmament and arms control as an indispensable element of the Federal Government's security policy. We still say that we want to create peace with fewer weapons. [applause] Since 1981, the alliance has unilaterally dismantled 2,400 nuclear warheads in Europe. So far, the Soviet Union has not made a similar move.

We want to achieve arms control accords that guarantee more security for all at the lowest possible balanced level of armed forces. That requires consideration for the security interests of all countries — the large, medium, and small states. Our alliance is based on the principle that a member's security also represents the other members' security. There must be no areas of less security. [applause]

We proceed from that position when disarmament and arms control is at issue. We respect our eastern interlocutors' legitimate security interests. Of course, we expect them to do the same.

Using the slogan equality and equal security, in the seventies the Soviet Union unilaterally oriented its security policy toward the United States, but at the same time threatened Western Europe with conventional and new intermediate-range weapons. That was a fatally wrong assessment, and Moscow has also realized that. Now, new thinking and indeed a new approach are necessary. On 17 February this year, General Secretary Gorbachev stated that the Soviet Union does not claim a grain more security than the United States has. Ladies and gentlemen, we expect that also to hold true regarding Western Europe and the FRG.

Let me point out from this rostrum — and I reiterate what I said in March — we are observing with interest and sympathy the political line which has been defined by General Secretary Gorbachev for his country and which has been declared as the Soviet Union's foreign policy. We hope that his words will be followed by the necessary deeds. [applause] If his course provides an opportunity leading to greater security, more cooperation, and in particular positive results, we will follow it.

Let me remind you in this respect of an important and proven principle of arms control policy. Political statements of intent on the purposes and goals weapons are supposed to serve, or analyses of whether there is an acute danger of war or not are not decisive for disarmament and arms control, all that may change very quickly. Existing weapons systems and the threat they constitute are what are decisive in our assessment. Therefore, we must state that the Soviet Union and its allies have military potentials in Europe that are numerically greatly superior to those of the United States and the alliance, and that can by no means be justified by national defense requirements. The figures speak for themselves. And if we look at realities, as they are — we must consider the facts — geographic and geostrategic advantages are clearly on the side of the Warsaw Pact. Every map shows that. Military strategy, organization, and disarmament of the Warsaw Pact armed forces are arrayed for comprehensive offensive operations. Soviet military doctrine proceeds from the assumption that a military conflict would not be carried out on Soviet soil, but on the territory of the enemy. From all that, ladies and gentleman, one can see an invasion capability by the Warsaw Pact toward Western Europe, while our armed forces — considering their mission, size, and structure — are not qualified for comprehensive offensive operations.

We must always bear in mind the big picture when we talk about disarmament and arms control, in particular in that important field of nuclear intermediate-range missiles. The security of all people concerned — I say of all people concerned — must not be decreased by disarmament.

Together with our partners in the WEU, we stated in November 1986, I quote: As far as prospects for progress in nuclear disarmament are concerned the establishment of conventional stability will become even more important and urgent. Simultaneously complete elimination of chemical weapons worldwide

will become more urgent. end of quote. In my government statement in March, I said: Together with our Western allies we will dynamically continue the process of disarmament and arms control in all negotiating forums. we want — and let me underline that clearly — equal efforts and progress in all fields. It is generally agreed that an international ban on chemical weapons can be attained. And how necessary that is, ladies and gentleman, has recently been demonstrated by the use of chemical weapons in Third World conflicts.

In the conventional sector, together with our French friends at the Halifax NATO council meeting a year ago, we took the initiative for negotiations from the Atlantic to the Urals, and we are energetically pursuing it at the Vienna talks. That the process of arms control will soon produce considerable success is in the general, and — of course — in our national interest. Never before in the history of arms control negotiations have there been so many venues and forums where comprehensive disarmament proposals were discussed. And let me emphasize this, never before have the chances of agreement in important major areas been as good as they are today. That could be achieved thanks to the consistent and continuous policy of our alliance which we, the Federal Republic, have substantially formulated and pursued.

The Soviet threat from longer range intermediate-range missiles was answered by our alliance in 1979, in terms of arms control policy, with the two-track decision. The United States has been negotiating in Geneva since 1981 on the basis of coordinated alliance positions. From the very beginning, those positions included the demand that both sides remove completely a number of longer range intermediate-range missiles, the zero option, and related restrictions on shorter range intermediate-range missiles. The two-track decision was developed by the Federal Government under my predecessor, Helmut Schmidt, and was implemented by my government. I can understand completely when my colleague Schmidt these days correctly points out that his policy was subsequently vindicated and turned out to be successful. [applause]

It is important to mention that again today, because in 1982-83, when we assumed government responsibility, we learned that at that time it was rumored among the Social Democrats that Helmut Schmidt had failed for quite different reasons. His own party, the SPD, ousted him, because of that correct weapons policy decision. [applause]

We had the experience then, ladies and gentlemen, that after the NATO two-track decision, the Soviet Union [shouts] left the Geneva negotiating table, to return 2 years later. The Reykjavik and Geneva summit meetings brought about a lasting turn for the better in relations between the superpowers and led to a rapprochement in the field of arms control policy, which exceeded many optimistic predictions. The clear and consistent course of this Federal Government and its allies [shouts] was opposed by you, ladies and gentlemen, from the very beginning, with vehement propaganda and was accompanied by most sinister predictions. [shouts] You irrationally mobilized whatever was possible. You showed emotional hostility toward that policy and

demanded a break with the alliance and an anti-American mobilization. Ladies and gentlemen, today, in view of the tangible successes, allow me to say to what extent you have been a political security risk in the past 3 years. [applause] You know, whoever predicted a fence of missiles, whoever predicted a new ice age or talked of black Friday, of a disaster, lost all credibility after Reykjavik to discuss that problem with us. [applause] You let me say it clearly — were most seriously mistaken in that crucial issue of arms control negotiations. You had a completely false estimate of the interests and the flexibility of Soviet leaders. Where would we be today if we had followed your advice? [applause] Advance unilateral concessions never get anything in return. Persistence, openness, and consistency at the negotiating table in representing one's own interests always pay off.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Reykjavik summit has proved a decisive breakthrough for the Geneva INF negotiations. Both sides have basically agreed to a zero solution in Europe for longer range intermediate-range missiles, while simultaneously limiting those systems to 100 warheads each to be deployed in the Asiatic part of the Soviet Union and in the United States. If such an agreement were achieved — I hope that we have good reason for optimism — it would be an outstanding result that I can only expressly welcome in the name of the Federal Government. [applause] Last but not least, it is also the merit of our persistent contribution to that policy.

Regrettably, in Reykjavik the Soviet Union linked an INF agreement with other negotiating factors. That was, indeed, a step backward. In late February this year, General Secretary Gorbachev removed that self-created obstacle from the negotiating table. In early March, the United States introduced the draft treaty in Geneva, coordinated within the alliance, which reflected the Reykjavik rapprochement. Shortly thereafter followed a draft of inspection stipulations that were coordinated in every detail with the deployment countries. During the Moscow visit by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz in mid-April, the Soviet leadership again confirmed the Reykjavik formula. Last week it introduced its own draft treaty in Geneva. However, as you know, it does not deal with shorter range intermediate-range missiles.

Let me clearly say here: Even if treaty drafts reflect many earlier achieved agreements, they are always the starting point of negotiations and not their result. They certainly contain the hard core of individual negotiating positions, and certainly also material that is negotiable in coming to an agreement.

How difficult it is to differentiate, and how people and parties who do not sit at the negotiating table can err and make wrong assessments, I have just indicated. I want to say that this danger is increased by attempts to accompany one's own proposals with loud propaganda so as to put the negotiating partner under pressure of public opinion. For all well-meaning observers interested in success — naturally most of all for a responsible government — this is valid: We must neither stab our own allies in the back by talking our own negotiating position to pieces, nor should we bury chances for further progress contained in the treaty drafts, nor ought we express premature hypotheses about the course of the negotiations, which could complicate an agreement in the end.

We in the Federal Government act exactly according to those principles. Together with our friends and allies, and on the basis of most detailed information from the parties to the negotiations, we are about to examine and assess proposals in a very intense way.

We are firmly convinced that the still open issues can be solved in a reasonable time. I want to say that reasonable time means that we will not make hasty decisions, but not dawdle either. In the very near future, if possible this year, the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting should take place, a treaty should be signed, and negotiations should take place. We know that such a treaty needs at least 1 year for ratification because of U.S. legislative custom. It must be our goal to make sure that adoption is possible during the current administration, in the current legislative session in the United States, and that the ensuing developments can be implemented.

We are firmly convinced that the remaining problems can be solved in the same period. I estimate that the conclusion of an INF agreement on abolishing longer range intermediate-range missiles in Europe is possible in that same period. Therefore, together with all our allies we support the U.S. position to strive for a global zero solution for longer range intermediate-range missiles. The global zero solution would abolish an entire weapons category.

Let me point out, in connection with still open verification problem, a significant matter no one contests. A zero solution to be valid for Europe only — not worldwide — complicates verification. Production could continue, such systems can be quickly transported from one place to another — including to Europe — and testing sites would not be shut down.

You know that in the case of the Soviet Union, production and testing sites are in the European part, which illustrates the special significance of the problem.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as to the shorter range intermediate-range missiles, I stated in my last government statement in March here in this house: Concern remains about the oppressive Soviet superiority in shorter range intermediate-range missiles. Therefore, the Federal Government expects the two world powers to commit themselves specifically and bindingly to immediate follow-up negotiations on shorter range intermediate-range systems. It must be the goal of the negotiations to reduce all systems to a lower level with similar ceilings.

Let me emphasize that our concern is over Soviet superiority in the military balance of forces. The United States submitted in its 2 March draft of an agreement on longer range intermediate-range missiles, as in 1981-82, the concept of similar ceilings in the 500-1,000 km range as an alliance position. Western concern about Soviet superiority in shorter range intermediate-range missiles, and Western insistence on accompanying limitations for those weapons systems have prompted Moscow to respond.

General Secretary Gorbachev, in his Prague speech on 13 April this year, proposed to begin discussing the problem of decreasing and eventually abolishing 500-1,000 km range missiles deployed on the European Continent, without linking it to the course and outcome of negotiations on the problems of longer range intermediate-range missiles.

In his talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz several days later, General Secretary Gorbachev said that a global zero upper limit for weapons with a 500-1,000 km range is possible and can be reached. After having been informed about the results of Secretary of State Shultz's Moscow visit, the Federal Government immediately started studying the Soviet proposals closely and carefully. On 27 April 1987, a meeting of ministers under my chairmanship made an initial assessment. Contrary to the recommendations of some thoughtless observers, of course no final assessment was made. [commotion on the floor]

I do not understand why you are mocking me, given the developments in the past 2 weeks. You were wrong in that respect, were you not? [applause]

How right we were in pursuing such a course became clear in Geneva. On 27 April 1987, the head of the Soviet delegation submitted his draft agreement and said shorter range intermediate-range missiles could be discussed and agreed upon in the framework of an INF agreement, or else separately. For the range of between 500 and 1,000 km, he suggested a zero option that would have to be confined to Europe, whereas globally he proposed a concept of equal upper limits. In addition, he demanded the inclusion of the Pershing 1A-type warheads on the Bundeswehr's intermediate-range missiles, which, as you know, are under strict U.S. control.

The U.S. delegation in Geneva resolutely rejected his oral statement. As the resolutions of the alliance and in particular at the recent WEU foreign and defense ministers meeting have shown, that rejection is fully supported by all. It is obvious that clear differences are coming to light between the Soviet statements in Moscow and Geneva and the explanations the Federal Government — and many others, by the way — were given in Bonn yesterday. Ladies and gentlemen, that shows how right the Federal Government is to expect the Soviet Union to set down in writing its position on the issue.

The Geneva proposal is not in the framework of the negotiations, because that INF agreement covers U.S. and Soviet missiles and launch facilities solely, not third-country systems. The point here is a principled position of the West on third-country systems.

The Federal Government and its allies will carefully study all aspects of the Geneva INF negotiations and in particular the problems related to the zero solution for part of the shorter range intermediate-range missiles. Ladies and gentlemen, these issues are too serious to allow us to leave the field to propaganda or uncalled for hectic activism. I have already pointed out how cautiously and responsibly we have to assess the draft agreement submitted by the Soviet Union.

It is all the more true that on the basis of mere oral statements, whose ultimate meaning is not definitely clear, we cannot make any arms control decisions based on principle alone. We cannot set our course in the crucial area of security on the basis of mere agency dispatches.

The essential criteria of our decisionmaking process are — and I stressed that in my government statement in March — that an early conclusion of an INF agreement would be clearly indicative of the seriousness and credibility of the arms control negotiations, and would provide an important impetus in other political fields.

We have to take into account that even after the longer range intermediate-range missiles have been removed, there will still be dangerous weapons potentials in the fields of shorter range intermediate-range nuclear missiles, as well as in chemical and conventional weapons.

Our alliance, ladies and gentlemen, lives on and has been successful for decades. Risks and burdens have been shared. We are deeply convinced that at the present decisive stage of arms control policy it is important that we are able to coordinate our interests in Europe and to speak with one voice. These days we appreciate particularly the great result of the policy of all federal governments in past decades, which has contributed to the close friendship and partnership with France. We appreciate our very close relationship with our British friends and with our allies and friends in NATO and the WEU. We are aware of the great importance of our partnership with the United States of America.

We are aware of our responsibility, which our history, our position in the alliance, and our situation in the center of Europe [shouts] as a divided country at the demarcation line of the two political-ideological systems and military alliances demand from us. [interjection]

I really do not understand you. These are words that should be supported by everyone. [applause, shouts]

What has become of our parliamentary debates, if you cannot even calmly listen to such clear self-evident facts [shouts] which, in particular for a man like Helmut Schmidt, were self-evident? [applause]

According to the Basic Law we must consider the fate of all Germans. Therefore, we are aware of the particular importance of our vote, the vote of the FRG, and our position toward the problems to be discussed in Geneva, within our alliance and beyond it. The Federal Government will promote its decision-making process by series of consultations and meetings at the highest levels.

I would like to remind you of my recent meeting with Mrs Thatcher prior to her visit to Moscow, of my meeting with President Mitterand in late March, of my meeting with him in Berlin next Sunday, of my consultations with French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac last Sunday, with Belgian Prime Minister Wilfried Martens yesterday, and with Italian Prime Minister Fanfani next week.

Next Monday, Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher will travel to Washington to consult with the U.S. Government. [shots]

I think it is very good that you are showing yourself for what you have become. [shouts, applause]

Further consultations, in particular in the competent bodies of the alliance are in the offing. They will give us the opportunity to cooperate in the necessary decisions of our alliance, and to make them in time — that is, in the near future — and thus to meet our responsibility.

Ladies and gentlemen, in problems of disarmament and arms control we must advance step by step and see to it that the dynamics of the process will be kept alive, that the process can be continued. What matters is to remove all serious weapons imbalances to increase stability worldwide, and to make peace more secure for all of us. That corresponds to our responsibility and we will face that responsibility and we will face that responsibility. [applause]

/8309

CSO: 5200/2532

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG: GENSCHER DISCUSSES DOUBLE ZERO OPTION IN BUNDESTAG

DW080721 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 1013 GMT 7 May 87

[Statement by Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher in the Bundestag debate on Bonn--live]

[Text] Mr president, esteemed ladies and gentlemen: The Bundestag debate today is taking place in a situation marked by extraordinary dynamism in the arms control process and by new prospects in the East-West relationship. This year of 1987 may become a year of far-reaching progress in all fields of disarmament. The Federal Government's consistent policy, which is oriented toward ensuring peace has essentially contributed to that development.

That policy pursues a course in accordance with the 1967 Harmel report, which connects the defensive capacity with the desire for dialogue, cooperation, and arms control. Only the consistent application of that policy in all its elements guarantees our security. It binds us equally to make defense efforts and seriously to try and find ways to reduce political tensions in the East-West relationship.

Ladies and gentlemen, such a policy does not seek to achieve superiority. It recognizes the other side's legitimate security interests and expects the other side to do the same. It wants to create durable security for all, and that, ladies and gentlemen, is the only policy that can create stability.

In its Brussels statement on conventional arms control of 12 December 1986, the alliance impressively defined the philosophy of the West's security policy once again. It says that the task of armed forces should only be to prevent wars and ensure self-defense. They should not be for aggression or to serve as instruments of political or military intimidation.

Ladies and gentlemen, the nuclear age has brought about a strangely paradoxical situation. On the one hand, it has created incredible capabilities of destruction and has exposed the natural bases of life to terrible dangers which, as Chernobyl has shown, even crosses borders. On the other hand, those very dangers have helped mankind realize that it can only survive together and that it has to cooperate to solve future problems. Whether we like it or not, we have become a community of survival in this world. [applause]

Ladies and gentlemen, dangers threatening the survival of mankind, and opportunities for a better future are closely linked. We have within our power to determine the course. Mastering such a task presupposes preparedness for comprehensive cooperation, including in East-West relations. Delamination and stubbornness can throw the world into interminable risks.

Therefore, the Federal Government welcomes the fact that at present negotiations over disarmament and arms control are continuing more comprehensively and deeply than ever before. At the same time, new perspectives to shape East-West relations are recognizable, which must be exploited for our stability. There is no lack of encouraging signs in the arms control sphere. The successful conclusion of the Stockholm disarmament conference

by the way, Mr Bahr, a German-French initiative — is an important step toward greater stability in Europe. [applause] The first experiences we have had since then are, as a whole, positive. It is also encouraging that the United States and the Soviet Union have just agreed on setting up centers in Washington and Moscow to decrease the nuclear risk. Eventually, it is especially important for us in the FRG that the zero solution for longer range intermediate-range missiles has come tangibly close. It is a negotiating goal we have tried to achieve since the end of the seventies.

In Geneva the United States and the Soviet Union are negotiating on a drastic reduction of their strategic nuclear weapons potentials. The U.S. President has just announced the submission of a draft treaty on a 50-percent range intermediate-range missiles are being negotiated. The Geneva disarmament conference has made significant progress in negotiations on a comprehensive worldwide ban on chemical weapons. The imminent conclusion of an agreement seems possible if all involved will work constructively and persistently on a solution to the few still pending issues. Conventional arms control calls for intensified efforts.

Ladies and gentlemen, in Vienna a date is being negotiated for a conference on the establishment of conventional stability in all of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. This NATO offer, too, was a German-French initiative. The goal must be that armed forces on both sides will correspond only to the demands of defense. No side must have the capability for an invasion. This, for using the western alliance, remains valid.

Mr Bahr, the alliance has set itself the following goals for negotiations in this field: It is important to establish a stable and safe level of armed forces aimed at eliminating imbalances. A gradual negotiation process that guarantees undiminished security of all involved at each stage is also important. It will be especially important to dismantle and abolish the capability of a surprise attack or a broad offensive. Further measures for confidence building and improving openness and predictability about military action are also involved. Eventually, effective verification measures are necessary — as in all other arms control agreements.

The Federal Government is trying to overcome the remaining differences of opinion on the western side regarding the negotiation framework. We regret this. We are trying our best. It is certainly not the fault of the government, colleague Bahr, if the agreement has not yet been concluded.

Through the comprehensive negotiating process, chemical weapons, the conventional balance of forces, strategic nuclear weapons, and intermediate-range weapons have been included in East-West negotiations. Like our defense efforts, these negotiations correspond to the core issue of western security policy — to prevent any war, not merely nuclear, but also conventional war. Disarmament and arms control remain integral parts of our security policy. [applause] The CSCE process and building confidence and cooperation has contributed to it considerably.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the Stockholm conference, on the subject of verification the Soviet Union gave up its decade-long resistance to effective control measures, particularly to obligatory on-site inspections. Only in that way did the Stockholm conference become a success. That change in the Soviet Union's basic attitude made progress in Geneva and Reykjavik possible. Preparedness for adequate and effective verification is an important contribution to confidence-building. He who has nothing to hide is prepared for verification. He who rejects verification exposes himself to the suspicion of wanting to hide something.

As to longer range intermediate-range missiles, the Federal Government has pursued with both parts of the two-track decision — the negotiation offer and the counterarmament part — the goal of having the Soviet Union remove the special threat emanating from the SS-20 missiles advanced armament [voruestung]. The counterarmament [Nachruestung] decision, and thus the decision to deploy U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, was a response to the Soviet advanced armament, nothing else.

The zero option was developed in the FRG, taken over by the Atlantic alliance, and included in U.S.-Soviet negotiations in 1981. The preparedness of the Soviet Union, expressed for the first time in Reykjavik, to respond to that zero solution is a decisive success for Western security policy. The abolition of all U.S. and Soviet land-based longer range intermediate-range missiles in Europe, envisaged by both sides, and the limitation to 100 warheads each in the Asiatic part of the Soviet Union and in the United States, would be a gain for European security. [applause] Ladies and gentlemen, it is certainly a security gain for Germans in the West and East.

The goal the Federal Government has set for itself — to create peace with fewer weapons — is standing its test. The zero solution specifically means the destruction of a great number of Soviet launching sites and missiles, which, ladies and gentlemen, carry a total of 1,335 nuclear warheads. On the western side, at present Pershing missiles and cruise missiles with 216 nuclear warheads would be abolished and destroyed.

Mr Bahr, you have accused us because of our attitude on disarmament policy. Should you not give some serious thought to whether it would not have been better for you to have stuck to your approach to the NATO two-track decision?

Ladies and gentlemen, abandoning the NATO two-track decision would have meant abandoning a real disarmament opportunity that is now beginning to materialize. [applause] After all, you proposed last fall to eliminate western counter armament if the Soviet Union decreased its armament to the 1979 level. It would mean several hundred warheads on SS-4 and SS-20 missiles.

Ladies and gentlemen, the FRG played a decisive part in the promising development that is in the offing now. Only by holding on to both parts of the two-track decision, not by dissociating ourselves from it, has such an agreement come tangibly close.

The strict observance of both elements of the NATO two-track decision has created a basis for the credibility and predictability of our policy. The government statement of 18 March 1987 pointed out the problem of the Soviet Union's substantial superiority in shorter range intermediate-range missiles and demanded the inclusion of those missiles in negotiations.

Since 1981, the alliance has felt that such an agreement should not lead to the emergence of a grey zone not covered by arms control negotiations, a grey zone of intermediate-range missiles with a 500-1,000 km range. It was the alliance's common goal to prevent evasion of the INF agreement. Regarding such missiles, the West is already facing the Soviet Union's superiority, because the United States does not have such systems, whereas the Soviet Union has between 130 and 160 missiles worldwide with multiple reloading capacity of launch facilities [mit mehrfacher Nachladefahigkeit der Abschussvorrichtungen]. Therefore, like an earlier draft, the U.S. draft of 2 March envisages limitations for intermediate-range missiles with a range of between 500 and 1,000 km. Different reactions from the Soviet Union to that

proposal — the federal chancellor referred to the differences in his government statement — once again justify the Federal Government's expectation that the Soviet Union should specify its ideas in writing. The Soviet proposal on a zero solution for shorter range intermediate-range missiles must be examined carefully and responsibly, as I have repeatedly urged and as has been confirmed in the government statement.

Ladies and gentlemen, any other position on such a crucial issue would be irresponsible. [applause]

That is all the more true because yesterday the Soviet Union through First Deputy Foreign Minister Vorontsov signaled its readiness to discuss all elements of its proposals. My fellow party member Mischnick said some very interesting things about the negotiations on shorter range intermediate-range missiles. [applause]

Ladies and gentlemen, we agree with our European alliance partners about the need for careful examination. We also share the willingness to work out a common position. In that respect we should always be aware of the fact — and I am saying this in view of some illusions and misgivings that have been expressed — that even after an agreement has been concluded on longer range intermediate-range missiles or even on a double zero solution, there will still be considerable nuclear potentials on both sides.

The Soviet Union's strategic nuclear systems can be used not only against the United States, but also against its European allies. The Soviet Union has air- and sea-based intermediate-range capabilities threatening all of Europe. On the other hand, the West has similar capabilities. That means that there are thousands of nuclear warheads on both sides, which may threaten all European nations.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Soviet shorter ranger intermediate-range missiles threaten us particularly because of our exposed geostrategic situation; and of course, they also threaten the armed forces of our allies and their facilities. The conclusion of an INF agreement, which the Soviet Union also considers necessary and achievable this year, would have consequences reaching far beyond the elimination of that weapons category. It would have a positive influence not only on arms control in the nuclear, chemical, and conventional fields, but possibly also on East-West relations as a whole. [applause]

/8309
CSO: 5200/2532

The meeting in Reykjavik has opened the door to a cooperative security policy. Different thinking is manifesting itself on both sides. It is directed toward cooperation instead of confrontation, armament and counterarmament. That door, ladies and gentlemen, cannot be closed again without shaking the hopes of people all over the world for cooperation and disarmament.

In the late sixties and early seventies we took advantage of Soviet and U.S. efforts to put their relationship on a new and more stable basis in order to achieve a fundamental improvement of the situation in Europe. The cooling down and hardening in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in the late seventies left the positive results of the detente process for Europe almost untouched.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG PARLIAMENTARY AIDE DOUBTS ON DOUBLE-ZERO OPTION

LD141410 Hamburg DPA in German 1244 GMT 14 May 87

[Text] Bonn (DPA) — Volker Ruehe, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group predicts that until the end of the month there will be a deeper discussion within the coalition of the issues concerning the reduction of medium-range missiles. On his return from talks in London, Ruehe said today in a DPA interview that all arguments against the double zero solution must be put on the table now.

In contrast to Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP), Ruehe holds the view that disarmament for missiles with a range of less than 500 kilometers will come to a halt if the double zero solution succeeds. The supporters of a complete dismantling of nuclear missiles with a range between 500-5,000 kilometers want to erect a "fire-proof wall" if that happens and to withdraw no shorter-range nuclear weapons. There is even talk of increasing numbers. Yet these weapons threatened the FRG above all.

Ruehe emphasized to his British interlocutors that this would also call into question the NATO strategy of deterrence, also wanted by Britain, because the FRG would have to reject being the only country to be exposed to a special threat. Ruehe said discussions about the double zero solution had been held at too superficial a level. The Union politician rejected charges that his parliamentary group is afraid of disarmament. In the interest of NATO strategy it is better to keep a limited number of nuclear missiles with a range of up to 1,000 kilometers than to go to zero with regard to missiles with a range of 500-5,000 kilometers.

Ruehe said that no pressure had been put on him in London for Bonn to reach a rapid decision. However, he thought that a decision would be made within the alliance by the end of the month. The British are waiting for Bonn to make a decision.

Meanwhile, CDU General Secretary Heiner Geissler, spoke again today in support of the zero solution for longer-range INF. The complete disarmament of shorter-range INF is being seriously examined. Also necessary is disarmament for short-range missiles, as well as chemical weapons and tanks. "The conventional superiority of the Soviet Union must be reduced." Geissler accused the SPD of having taken up Soviet positions in foreign and security policy.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2532

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG DEFENSE MINISTER: EUROPE AWAITS GERMAN DECISION

LD150944 Hamburg DPA in German 0759 GMT 15 May 87

[Excerpts] Stavanger 15 May (DPA) — The NATO defense ministers today met for the final sitting of the meeting of the alliance's so-called Nuclear Planning Group. [passage omitted]

The reservations of Defense Minister Manfred Woerner toward a "double" zero option were not shared by his opposite numbers yesterday. Woerner told journalists: "Since the German Government has not yet decided, why should others be more German than the Germans?" A "clear German attitude" would "finally determine the attitude of the alliance," or at least the attitude of the "leading power," the United States.

Woerner said: "Since it is a matter of European and German interests in particular, people are waiting for the German opinion." Once again he warned against "singling out" the FRG within the alliance by the fact that predominantly nuclear battlefield weapons, which could be used almost exclusively in Germany, remain in Europe.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2532

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG'S GENSCHER: DECISION ON DOUBLE-ZERO OPTION DUE SOON

LD151346 Hamburg DPA in German 1119 GMT 15 May 87

[Excerpts] Bonn, 15 May (DPA) — Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher today once again spoke in support of a double zero option on the reduction of medium-range missiles, that is, the complete removal of longer and shorter-range missiles. On the broad support for such a solution, which became apparent at the meeting of NATO defense ministers in Stavanger, Genscher said on North German Radio [Norddeutscher Rundfunk]: "I have warned from the start against rejecting the Soviet Union's proposal out of hand, which has met with a positive reaction from the United States." A German decision will be made "very soon." However, it was a question of very complex matters, he said. [passage omitted]

Genscher made it clear in his interview that he rejected a connection between the double zero option and further steps toward disarmament, such as in chemical or conventional weapons. The chancellor's statement did, however, give the impression of links between the categories. The foreign minister said: "I would feel better if the Soviet missiles which threaten us today were no more in the future."

At the same time, Genscher warned against the idea of a new counter-buildup, perhaps to modernize the existing systems in the shorter ranges of inf. In such a case, the government statement would have to be invoked, [angerufen werden] he said. Genscher recalled Kohl's words: "Achieve peace with fewer and fewer weapons."

/8309

CSO: 5200/2532

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG: KOHL ANNOUNCES POSITION ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Kohl on Disarmament

LD151106 Hamburg DPA in German 1013 GMT 15 May 87

[Text] Bonn (DPA) — Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl has spoken in support of including all nuclear weapons with ranges from zero to 1,000 kilometers with regard to efforts to achieve disarmament in the sphere of medium-range missiles. A declaration made by Kohl, read to the press by government spokesman Herbert Schmuelling today, says the goal must be to reach a viable solution which raises the security of all concerned, particularly the Germans.

The chancellor furthermore demanded a reduction in the conventional forces and chemical weapons of the Warsaw Pact, by which the Federal Republic is also threatened.

The chancellor stated that he is above all interested in developing common European positions toward the Geneva negotiations on medium-range missiles. The running consultations within the alliance, as well as a close series of high-ranking bilateral consultations served this end. A decision concerning the security situation on the European continent into the next century should not be taken in a hurry.

Kohl stated that the Geneva negotiations are not forcing people into over-hasty decisions, as the proposals of the United States and the Soviet Union were not yet completely on the table. The negotiating partners had also decided to continue their work on the agreement until early autumn without a break. There is therefore enough time to put forward European positions.

Kohl assured his audience that the Federal Government wants a politically viable position which guarantees the security interests of the German people. "In this I am not prepared to follow the over-hasty advice of those who in the past few years have continued to err, as has been proven."

The chancellor said that the Geneva negotiations on short-range INF are a success for the Federal Government and its Western friends.

Bonn would do everything in its power to make an agreement on longer-range INF possible within the year. "It is a matter of a question of the fate of European security, and at the same time a turning point in arms control policy. For the first time a whole category of weapons would be completely removed. Kohl once more spoke in support of a summit meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Kremlin boss Mikhail Gorbachev.

'Text' of Kohl Declaration

LD151232 Hamburg DPA in German 1100 GMT 15 May 87

["Text" of declaration by FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl on current state of disarmament negotiations on medium-range weapons in Europe, on 15 May in Bonn]

[Text] Bonn, 15 May (DPA) — Chancellor Helmut Kohl today made a declaration on the current state of disarmament negotiations on medium-range weapons in Europe. The text is as follows:

1. An agreement on longer-range INF [weapons] has come within reach. It will envision the complete removal of these weapons from Europe. This success is based on the clear and committed attitude of our alliance, to which the FRG has made a decisive contribution.
2. The FRG will do everything in its power to make such an agreement possible within the year. It is a matter of a question of the fate of European security, and, at the same time, a decisive turning point in arms control policy: For the first time, the complete removal of a whole category of weapons is imminent.
3. The FRG will therefore support President Reagan in this decisive phase of the negotiations to the best of its ability, just as it has always done in past years on key questions of joint security. We are unchanged in our support for a further summit between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in this year to seal the breakthrough in the area of arms control.
4. If today there are negotiations on shorter-range INF in Geneva, then this is a success for the FRG and its Western friends. It was us who from the very start pointed out that a solution for longer-range INF must not be circumvented by shorter-range weapons; there must also be talks on these systems.
5. It is therefore in the Germans' very own interest that there are no negotiations covering only part of an area. In this way, an agreement only for weapons with a range of 500 to 1,000 kilometers would leave out the very weapons which threaten our country in particular. Therefore, weapons of all ranges between 0 and 1,000 km must be included, with the goal of a viable solution which raises the security of all concerned, above all the Germans as well.
6. The superiority of the Warsaw Pact in conventional forces and chemical weapons must also be seen in this context, which also particularly threaten our country. The FRG therefore strongly supports negotiations on conventional stability from the Atlantic to the Urals, and a global ban on chemical weapons.
7. I am especially interested in developing common European positions on the Geneva talks on medium-range missiles. The running consultations in the alliance serve this end, as well as a close series of high-ranking bilateral meetings.
8. A decision of such far-reaching implications — it is a matter of our continent's security far into the next century — must not be made in a hurry. Even the situation at the negotiations in Geneva does not force us into hurried decisions, as the complete

proposals of both sides are not yet on the table. The negotiating partners have also decided to continue their work on the treaty into early fall without a break, so that enough time remains to bring in the European position.

9. The FRG wants a politically viable position that guarantees the security interests of our people. I am not prepared to follow the overly hasty advice of those, who, as was proven, erred again and again in the past few years.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2532

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADA'S STAND ON INF ISSUES DISCUSSED

Clark Interview

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 1 May 87 p A5

[Article by Jeff Sallot, Ottawa]

[Text]

Western European allies should not choke off the possibility of a nuclear arms control agreement between Washington and Moscow at an early stage, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark says.

There is Canadian concern that Western European attitudes might be an obstacle to an arms-control deal between the two superpowers, Mr. Clark said in an interview yesterday.

There has been a lot of progress by the United States and the Soviet Union in arms talks on the possibility of eliminating medium- and short-range nuclear missiles based in Europe, he said.

The Soviet and U.S. proposals are "serious and significant."

But some of the allies have expressed alarm that elimination of the missiles could weaken U.S. resolve to use the U.S.-based strategic nuclear forces in defence of Western Europe.

"We can't allow a process which has involved this much movement by the superpowers to be frustrated at the beginning by some understandable but surmountable differences within the alliance," Mr. Clark said.

Western European governments are generally aware that there would be unfavorable consequences if they were identified as the reason

why progress was not made, he said.

The allies have an obligation to try to resolve their differences of opinion on the issue soon enough to allow President Ronald Reagan sufficient time to negotiate a treaty, Mr. Clark said.

Mr. Reagan's term of office does not expire until January of 1989, but most diplomatic and political observers say his effectiveness in the field of foreign policy diminishes as the 1988 fall election approaches, Mr. Clark said.

He is optimistic that the allies will resolve the issue among themselves before this fall.

Mr. Clark announced yesterday that he is adding a stop in West Germany to his visit to Europe, which begins on Sunday.

He will meet West German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher on May 9 and 10. The arms-control issue and the possibility of further economic sanctions against South Africa will be among topics for discussion.

Mr. Clark begins his tour in Poland, where the agenda includes talks with Polish officials about their intentions for debt repayment to Canada.

He will be in Berlin on Wednesday and Thursday. That city is marking its 750th anniversary this year.

Mr. Clark will spend three days in Hungary, where there will be a range of discussion subjects, including trade and commercial relations.

CITIZEN 18 Apr Editorial

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 18 Apr 87 p B2

[Editorial: "At Last, Nuclear Arms To Decline"]

[Text]

Prospects for the first-ever nuclear reduction treaty have never been brighter. Even the usually dour U.S. State Secretary George Shultz is optimistic about an early accord following his Moscow visit.

The upbeat mood in U.S.-Soviet relations — despite the recent revelations about embassy eavesdropping and sexual entrapment — reflects the real progress made at the Reykjavik summit and since on the elimination of intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) from Europe.

Both sides now agree that all Euromissiles of medium-range (over 1,000 kilometres) should be removed from NATO and Warsaw Pact territory within four to five years. The Soviets will be allowed to retain 100 in Soviet Asia and the Americans 100 in the U.S.

Still to be negotiated are the precise verification measures to be incorporated in an INF treaty. But Mikhail Gorbachev agreed with Shultz that these must be both strong and intrusive. The U.S. inspection blueprint has already been tabled in Geneva. Soviet ideas will be unveiled there next week.

The issue of shorter-range missiles (SRINF) in Europe — those with a range of 500-1,000 kilometres — was also addressed at the Moscow talks. Following his offer last week in Prague to negotiate their reduction, Gorbachev told Shultz he was willing to eliminate all of them within one year if the U.S. did likewise.

The state secretary promised to present this proposal to his NATO allies. He started the consultation process Wednesday at a meeting in Brussels of NATO foreign ministers, including External Affairs Minister Joe Clark.

While there is some reluctance among West Europeans, particularly West Germans, about NATO's agreeing to a nuclear-free Central Europe in the face of Soviet conventional military superiority, the obvious popular attraction of such a result bodes well for its eventual acceptance.

The fear of "decoupling" the U.S. from the nuclear defence of Europe is the main argument against INF and SRINF agreements to eliminate all Euromissiles. Yet this can be readily countered. Apart from the 300,000 American soldiers still stationed in Europe, American nuclear-capable aircraft based in Britain, the untouched British and French nuclear forces and U.S. nuclear-armed submarines and ships would still be in the area.

The significance of a European nuclear reduction accord would be far greater than the number of warheads and carriers affected would indicate. It could lead to much greater confidence, a superpower summit, progress on reducing strategic nuclear forces and even conventional force reductions.

It is now clear that Gorbachev wants to reduce his nuclear burden. NATO should help him do so provided Western security can still be maintained.

CITIZEN 24 Apr Editorial

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 24 Apr 87 p A8

[Editorial: "Politics of Arms"]

[Text]

NATO would place itself in an impossible position if it were to reject Mikhail Gorbachev's offer to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear missiles from Europe and refuse to consider his suggestion that even shorter-range ones be removed. Yet that's exactly what the retiring military commander of the Atlantic alliance, Gen. Bernard Rogers, recommends.

Doubtless it makes military sense for NATO to retain some nuclear weapons in Europe to offset the superior Soviet conventional forces there. The doctrine of flexible response remains NATO policy.

What the supreme allied commander deliberately ignores, in a "secret" analysis being considered this week by NATO, is the political need for Western governments to respond positively whenever there's a chance of reducing reliance on nuclear weapons.

The Western public mood senses that there is now an opportunity that didn't exist in 1979 when NATO governments, led by West Germany, decided to offset the new threat posed by the deployment of Soviet SS-20 missiles.

Two years later, NATO endorsed President Reagan's zero option proposal to eliminate all Euromissiles from both sides of the European theatre. Now that Gorbachev has at last accepted the same zero solution, NATO really has no choice but to pocket the Soviet move.

Rogers criticizes the idea of taking out all INF missiles from Europe at this time. But his advice is purely military. He knows that NATO governments are not prepared to spend more on conventional arms to bring theirs up to the same levels as the East's. But he conveniently overlooks the continued presence of U.S. forward-based aircraft, submarines and ships available to the European command, all nuclear-capable.

Rogers goes even further in response to Gorbachev's second zero-option offer about scrapping all shorter-range nuclears. The general not only opposes this but he reportedly recommends that the U.S. deploy short-range missiles of its own on European soil.

A military commander usually tries to overcompensate. But the responsibility of elected governments is to determine the lowest common denominator of military force required consistent with the maintenance of security and balance.

Since NATO itself initiated the move to do away with all INF weapons from Europe, it has no choice but to continue with that policy. How could we explain departing from it now, just because the Soviets offer to throw all shorter-range missiles into the pot?

The new issue posed by Gorbachev's latest offer demands careful military and political consideration by NATO. But the "old" INF deal must now be signed, sealed and delivered to a public that has waited too long for it, Rogers notwithstanding.

CITIZEN 25 Apr Article

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 25 Apr 87 p B6

[Article by George Grande: "Anything Seems Possible in European Arms Talks"]

[Text] These are crucial days for military disarmers as the Geneva talks resume in an atmosphere of hope.

Big things are going on between the superpowers and among European nations. The skill with which they are managed will determine whether they prove dangerous or helpful for lasting peace.

The most eye-catching potential development lies in the field of nuclear arms reduction. Ever since last October's Reykjavik superpower summit, it's been a new game with new proposals and variations surfacing nearly every week.

The net result could be a nuclear-free Europe to begin with — or almost one. Such a possibility a year ago would have been laughed out of court. Now it's talked about in both NATO and Warsaw Pact circles with increasing frequency.

There are now actually four broad types of nuclear weapons in Europe being discussed. Up to a short while ago, there were only two. At Reykjavik, only one was seriously addressed.

This was what NATO calls intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF). They have a range of over 1,000 kilometres and some up to 3,000. Between them they can reach all the capitals of both alliances on the continent. They include on the allied side U.S. cruise missiles stationed in Britain, Belgium, West Germany and Italy and Pershing 2s deployed in Germany.

On the Warsaw Pact side, they mean Soviet SS-20 missiles (with triple warheads), and SS-4s. All of these could constitute the core of the first nuclear reduction treaty ever. The basics — total removal from Europe on both sides with 100 remaining in Soviet Asia and 100 in the U.S. — have already been agreed. Verification details remain to be settled.

The second category has been much in the news of late. It comprises shorter-range, intermediate-range forces (SRINF) having a range of 500 to 1,000 kilometres.

The Soviet ones include SS-23s and SS-12/22 Scaleboard missiles. The U.S. Pershing 1s in Germany are the only deployed NATO weapons in this general category.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev surprised Secretary of State George Shultz in Moscow a week ago by proposing that all of these be removed within a year. But he wasn't very specific about what he included in his definition of shorter-range. By inference he may have also been talking about the other two categories.

The third is that of battlefield missiles that can be either nuclear, conventional or chemical. These are Soviet SCUDS, SS-21s and FROGS, matched by NATO's Lance missiles (and the French Plutons). The prospect of eliminating all of this sort is causing European NATO members some anxiety and soul-searching.

Finally, there are other tactical nuclear weapons such as bombs and artillery shells that haven't yet been discussed in detail by the two sides. But if Gorbachev really means what he says, they should all go as well. He suggested in Prague the eventual elimination of what he called "operational-tactical" missiles, probably meaning those in the third category. But he also mentioned doing away with "tactical nuclear weapons," which could include everything that remains.

Many Western analysts believe that the Soviet leader has decided that all nuclear weapons must be discarded because, the speculation goes, he is convinced that a nuclear war cannot be won by either side, no matter how it starts.

For that fundamental reason, he is giving top priority to the question, "How can this be brought about?" He told a neutral statesman recently that he intends "to bombard the West", with all kinds of proposals in an intensive effort to achieve his nuclear-free objective.

He is realistic enough to realize that the problem must be attacked progressively. Therefore he chose INF for starters and had no trouble at all in reversing his own policy that previously had linked INF reductions to an agreement on Star Wars.

Even before an INF pact was signed, Gorbachev couldn't resist throwing SRINF into the pot and broadly hinting that battlefield missiles and even more were also negotiable to zero. In fact Reagan's "zero option" proposal appealed so much to the Soviet leader that he took it over as his own — and doubled it.

On the European defence front, West Europeans are slowly realizing that the U.S. won't stay in Europe forever and that nuclear weapons won't either. As Southam correspondent James Ferrabee recently put it, the problem is "determining how Western Europeans can arm and defend themselves in a Europe without nuclear arms and where the U.S. slowly withdraws not only its nuclear missiles, but also its 350,000 odd troops."

The beginning of Europe's answer may lie in the revival of the seven-nation Western European Union that is meeting in Luxembourg next week. But that is another story.

So too is that of the Common Market's negotiating with the Warsaw Pact's economic arm, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), to establish official relations. Such a possibility was inconceivable a few years ago.

The exciting news, though, is about nuclear arms reductions. The momentum is so strong that it won't go away until it's resolved one way or another. Ask any European — or his wife.

(George Grande, a former Canadian ambassador, is now a member of the Citizen's editorial board)

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

FRG RISKS 'ISOLATION' --Bonn (DPA)--FDP General Secretary Helmut Haussmann today warned against the threat of the Federal Republic being isolated in disarmament questions. The NATO Nuclear Planning Group session in Stavanger had shown that there would be very little understanding for the Federal Republic if it broke ranks with NATO, Haussmann said in Bonn. The British Government has left no doubt that it would not allow itself to be forced into a braking role in disarmament questions. Haussmann stressed that disarmament, not counterarmament, is the need of the moment. For this reason the Federal Government would be well advised to try and keep in tune with its NATO partners so as to avert a totally unnecessary isolation of the Federal Republic. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in German 1021 GMT 15 May 87] /8309

CSO: 5200/2532

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR'S KARPOV SUGGESTS 'EQUAL' CONVENTIONAL FORCE REDUCTION

Interview on BBC

LD202239 London BBC Television Network in English 1910 GMT 18 May 87

[From the "Panorama" program entitled "Gorbachev and the Defense of Europe" presented by Fred Emery; including interview with "chief Soviet arms negotiator" Viktor Karpov, identified by screen caption, by unidentified correspondent; date, place not given -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Karpov] We suggest that NATO and the Warsaw Pact reduce their forces to equal and minimum levels, minimum levels that will exclude waging any offensive operations against each other, so that the reductions will bring about such forces on both sides that will be sufficient only for defense. If we establish the lines that the sides will follow in their reductions of the forces, to agreed levels and open them, all the regions, for inspection, we can have the guarantees that the reductions are brought out exactly as it was prescribed.

[Correspondent] So the principle of inspection would be extended to conventional forces...

[Karpov, interrupting] Yes, yes.

[Correspondent] ...on a wide scale, across Europe?

[Karpov] Yes, just across all Europe from Atlantic to the Urals.

[Correspondent] So, you would be willing to accept American inspectors traveling throughout the European part of the Soviet Union?

[Karpov] Yes, in our inspection, traveling through Britain. [passage omitted]

[Karpov] You see, we feel that the situation in Europe, nuclearized Europe, is very dangerous. In fact, we see the danger also not only in the presence of those missiles and all other nuclear weapons but in the fact that the military doctrine of NATO is the doctrine of use of nuclear weapons, in any conflict. We might imagine even a conflict that will be provoked by NATO forces and will lead to a nuclear conflict. So we feel that alongside with the elimination of nuclear forces in Europe, we should build up a system of security that will exclude the use of force in Europe, any force, conventional or nuclear. [passage omitted]

[Karpov] I think the best choice is to accept the Soviet proposal to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe, together with the elimination of SRINF missiles so

that we can build on that a new system of security of the European Continent which will be accompanied also, not only by the reductions, but by reductions in the conventional forces.

[Correspondent] And if they don't accept that?

[Karpov] So, the possibility will be lost. The unique may be possible and we are not to be blamed for that. [passage omitted]

BBC Comment

LD201124 London BBC World Service in English 0115 GMT 19 May 87

[Text] The Soviet Union has made another far-reaching surprise offer to the West -- this time a drastic reduction of conventional forces by both East and West to such small numbers they could be used only for defense and never for offensive operations. And it's offered to allow United States military inspectors to travel throughout the European part of the Soviet Union to check the agreement was being carried out. The offer came from one of the Soviet Union's veteran negotiators, Mr Viktor Karpov, director of arms control for the Soviet Foreign Ministry in a BBC television interview in Moscow. Immediate Western reaction was skeptical, as our defense correspondent Harold Briley reports:

[Briley] This latest Soviet disarmament offer is as startling at first sight as its other recent offers to cut back nuclear arsenals. This time it involves conventional forces in Europe in which the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies have overwhelming superiority in troops, tanks, artillery and frontline aircraft. That's what the West fears most and why NATO insists on keeping nuclear weapons to deter attack it cannot stem with inferior conventional forces. But now Mr Karpov has suggested NATO and the Warsaw Pact reduce their conventional forces to what he called equal and minimum levels, sufficient only for defence but not powerful enough to wage offensive operations. To guarantee the cuts were made, Mr Karpov said the whole region from the Atlantic to the Urals could be opened up to inspection. He said the Soviet Union would accept U.S. military inspectors travelling throughout the European part of the Soviet Union and Soviet inspectors would travel West Europe, including Britain. West Germany's immediate reaction as the NATO nation most vulnerable to both conventional and nuclear attack came from its defense minister, Mr Woerner, who declared he'd be very satisfied if the offer were repeated at the negotiating table and it could be verified. But he was skeptical because previous public Soviet offers like this had not been followed up in negotiations. Britain's defense secretary, Mr George Younger, was equally doubtful. Britain, he said, would discuss such an offer very willingly, very readily and very quickly, but the Russians had always resolutely refused previously as the West had sought conventional force reductions for years and years. Mr Younger said Mr Karpov had been very smooth, talking of inspection, but they previously offered inspection only in Russian aircraft with Russian guides excluding security areas, which was not worth having. There'd have to be real safety and effective verification to make sure the Russians did not cheat.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1499

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET CSCE ENVOY SEES 'REASON FOR HOPE'

PM201010 Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish 9 May 87 p 20

[Interview with Yuriy Kashlev, head of Soviet delegation at Vienna conventional arms reduction talks, by APN correspondent Dmitriy Ardamatskiy in Vienna; date not given]

[Text] Vienna -- [Ardamatskiy] The third and final session of the Vienna conference has just opened. What prospects does it offer?

[Kashlev] There is reason for hope in the fact that nobody now -- unlike at previous times -- questions the importance and necessity of the European process to strengthen security and cooperation on the continent. In other words, the basis now exists for the participants in the conference to approve a constructive final document to continue developing the spirit of Helsinki.

Without dismissing the importance of other aspects of this process, I believe that priority must be given to resolving the problem of security, both political and military. Poland's proposal of confidence-building and disarmament measures in Europe is precisely designed to attain a new level and to strengthen political and military detente. In other words, we believe that the Vienna conference must recommend a continuation of the Stockholm conference, which in the next phase would establish real confidence-building and disarmament measures.

However, we are seriously worried by the fact that the NATO participants in the conference have not yet defined their position on the politicomilitary problems. Furthermore the West has made no proposals concerning matters of military detente.

[Ardamatskiy] Nevertheless consultations have begun between Warsaw Pact and NATO countries on the future reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe.

[Kashlev] True, but the NATO countries do not want these consultations to take place within the framework of the European process. They are even insisting that they take place at the embassies of NATO or Warsaw Pact countries and under no circumstances within the context of the Vienna conference. However it would be natural for the negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe to be a continuation of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures (Stockholm I), which was a success and took place on a European basis.

Second, the difficulty is that NATO flatly refuses to accept that the discussion of conventional arms issues and the results of this discussion take account of the opinion and voice of Europe's neutral and nonaligned states.

We do not accept NATO circles' attempts to classify the neutral and nonaligned states as second-class countries. Do they not participate with equal rights in the European process? Did they not participate in the Stockholm conference?

[Ardamatskiy] Pending the solution of this problem, how have the two blocs' positions been defined?

[Kashlev] The Warsaw Pact countries' position is as follows: They declare themselves in favor of a mutual and substantial reduction of conventional weapons in Europe in stages, from the Atlantic to the Urals, and in favor of European stability at a much lower military level. However, we are very worried by NATO's stance, which could frustrate all the efforts in this field. The NATO representatives evade the world "reductions" and instead talk about "equalization" of forces, the elimination of the "imbalance" supposedly reflected in the Warsaw Pact forces' superiority over the NATO forces.

There is a certain asymmetry, as there has always been, and it is due to differences in the structure of the NATO and Warsaw Pact Armed Forces, to geographical factors, and so forth. But this does not mean that there is not an overall balance of forces between them.

The NATO countries do not include the French and Spanish Armed Forces in their calculations. Why not? Are they neutral countries? By no means. By the same token, the Warsaw Pact could exclude the Polish and Czechoslovak Armed Forces from its calculations and insist that NATO enjoys a superiority in conventional forces.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1499

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU POLITBURO'S DEMICHEV COMMENTS ON ARMS ISSUE

PM161727 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meetings in Bulgaria"]

[Excerpts] Sofia, 13 May--The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, arrived in Stara Zagora today. During a meeting with city and okrug leaders, the delegation members were told that the direct ties established here with Soviet enterprises have helped the development of many priority avenues of scientific and technical progress in the okrug. Now 10 percent of all output exported by Bulgaria to the USSR bears the brand name of Stara Zagora Okrug enterprises. A conversation also developed about the activity of soviet and people's councils and their role in the restructuring being implemented in the USSR and Bulgaria.

The Soviet guests visited the Beroe Robotics Combine. It is one of the pioneers in the creation of joint Soviet-Bulgarian enterprises, and is part of the Beroe (Stara Zagora) and Krasnyy Proletariy (Moscow) Science-and-Production Association. The association produces robotics complexes and processing centers meeting the best world standards.

A Bulgarian-Soviet friendship rally was held at the plant. It was addressed by P.N. Demichev.

The coordination of fraternal countries' activity is also a necessary condition for implementing a policy which will ensure the preservation of peace on earth, mankind's salvation from nuclear catastrophe, and the creation of an all-embracing system of international security.

The Soviet Union's proposals and the fraternal countries' valuable initiatives receive the broadest international response. Thanks to the far-reaching proposals put forward in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement, the position taken by the USSR at the Reykjavik meeting, and the subsequent flexible policy on disarmament issues, a new atmosphere has developed in the world, an atmosphere fettering the actions of the forces of militarism and aggression and creating real prerequisites for the reaching of accords aimed at reducing nuclear arms, freeing Europe from medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles, and eliminating chemical weapons.

We are grateful to the Bulgarian People's Republic for the support for our proposals on medium-range missiles and on missiles for operational and tactical purposes expressed in the statement by the Bulgarian National Assembly's Foreign Policy Commission.

Reaching accords on these missiles would make it possible to consolidate the atmosphere of trust and pave the way to a nuclear-free world for mankind. For this purpose it is necessary -- and this applies primarily to Washington -- to abandon imperial ambitions and hegemonist claims, anticommunist prejudices, attempts to dictate conditions to the whole world, and preparations for "Star Wars." We believe that the new political thinking will become a mobilizing force for all peoples in the world.

The USSR Supreme Soviet makes active use of its potential to bring the truth about the foreign policy of the Soviet state and of fraternal socialist countries to the knowledge of the millions, and to step up the efforts by parliamentarians in the struggle to strengthen international security. Interparliamentary exchanges have been significantly stepped up in recent times, and this reflects the desire by most states for mutual understanding and for quest for ways to ease international tension.

In conclusion P.N. Demichev conveyed fraternal greetings to those present from the working class, working people, and the entire Soviet people, wishing the combine's working people new successes in their work and in the fulfillment of the 13th BCP Congress decisions.

The delegation was afterwards briefed on the economic association's work on the manufacture of disc memory systems.

The delegation is accompanied on its tour by S. Todorov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the National Assembly.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1507

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S KAPITSA ON ASIAN SECURITY: LIMIT SUBMARINE ACTIVITY

[Editorial report] Delhi THE HINDUSTAN TIMES in English for 2 April 1987 publishes on pages 1 and 16 an "exclusive interview" by Bhabani Sen Gupta with Mikhail Kapitsa, identified as "Moscow's best-known expert on Asian affairs," former deputy foreign minister and now director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies.

The interview includes the following comments:

"Mr Kapitsa gave a clearer exposition of Mr Gorbachev's Asia-Pacific security diplomacy than any Soviet authority has done before. He said, 'We have a step by step approach, and we are not targeting any particular time frame. The first step is normalisation of bilateral relations between countries of the Asia-Pacific region. We ourselves are making a determined effort in this direction, and we would welcome other countries do the same, including India, Pakistan , China and Vietnam.

""When progress has been made in normalisation of bilateral relations, the second step will be to resolve conflicts in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and so on. If these conflicts can be resolved, a proper climate will be created to discuss on a multilateral basis issues like reduction of armed strength, of military budgets, and regional arms control measures. For instance, it will be in the interest of all nations in the Asia-Pacific region if an agreement could be reached that submarines will keep clear of all national coastlines by 25 miles.'

"Proceeding, he said, 'We support the concept of nuclear-free zones. However, nuclear-free zones can be built only on the basis of regional consensus. We have welcomed the decision of the countries of the South Pacific to have the region declared a nuclear-free zone. If the ASEAN countries agree to make South-East Asia a nuclear-free zone, we shall support it.'"

CSO: 5200/1489

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET PAPERS CARRY MAY DAY CELEBRATION EDITORIALS

PRAVDA 30 Apr

PM061233 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 87 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Solidarity of Millions: May Day Flags Over the Planet"]

[Excerpt] There is no more urgent and important task in the world today than delivering mankind from the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe. The survival of our civilization is at stake. Everyone knows whose fault this is and no propaganda incantations will help imperialism to wash away the stigma with which it has been branded for pushing the world to the brink of a nuclear war. The peoples of all countries, great and small, face an urgent task -- thwarting the aggressive plans of the militarist circles and the military-industrial complex and achieving a normalization of the situation in the world.

The creation of a comprehensive system of international security is a pressing command of our times. The basic principles for the creation of such a system have been drawn up by the Soviet Union and submitted for discussion. People have not forgotten that it was our country which unilaterally observed a moratorium on nuclear explosions for more than 18 months. With a feeling of sincere approval and hope people welcomed the proposal for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the 21st century put forward by M.S. Gorbachev 15 January 1986 as well as the statement issued on 28 February this year on the problem of the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. The CPSU Central Committee May Day Slogans contain an appeal to the peoples of the world to demand the destruction of nuclear arsenals and chemical weapons and to forestall the militarization of space.

The new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries offer an opportunity to significantly change the situation in the continent of Europe and the world as a whole. The peoples of Europe are facing the huge task of eliminating nuclear arsenals throughout the continent, achieving radical reductions in conventional arms and armed forces, and creating nuclear-free zones. Europe's historic chance must not be wasted. Likewise we must not allow the quest for ways of strengthening the security and peaceful cooperation between Asian and Pacific countries to be dragged out for ever.

The Soviet initiatives were received throughout the world as the embodiment of the new political thinking, they have opened a fundamentally new chapter in the struggle for the elimination of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, for mankind's survival.

Unfortunately, the new trends and approaches in international affairs are as yet asserting themselves with difficulty. Certain circles in the United States and other NATO countries are still under the spell of the old thinking and are hampering the positive processes in international affairs. Furthermore, they continue to crank up the flywheel of the arms race and steer a course toward the militarization of space. This is a dangerous and hopeless policy. People are resolutely denouncing it and stepping up their actions in favor of peace, disarmament, and reliable security for all.

In greeting May Day, Soviet people are declaring their boundless support for the peace-loving foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet state and their readiness to do everything in their power to ensure a triumph on our planet of a world without weapons and wars.

With a feeling of legitimate pride we pronounce the words of the CPSU Central Committee May Day slogans:

Long live the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the policy of peace and people's security, of broad international cooperation!

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 May

PM071435 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 May 87 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Following the Course of Renewal"]

[Excerpt] On the May Day banners are the words: "Peace throughout the world!" Socialism and peace are inseparable concepts. Almost 7 decades separate Lenin's Decree on Peace proclaimed at the dawn of Soviet power from the Basic Principles of an All-Embracing System of International Security put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress. Yet how these documents harmonize in their sense and spirit! The Soviet Union's Leninist foreign policy is a policy of peace and security of peoples and of broad international cooperation. A policy aimed at freeing mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences and at ensuring lasting peace on earth. The Communist Party and the Soviet state consider that the people have no more important task now than the struggle against the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, for the curbing of the arms race, and for disarmament.

So long as international reaction whips up the arms race and does not abandon its policy of social revenge and "crusades" against socialism, the USSR and the Soviet state will do everything necessary to keep the defense might of our country and the socialist community at the requisite level. The CPSU Central Committee Appeal to the Soviet people on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of Great October said: "The Soviet people can be sure: We will never allow military superiority on the part of imperialism, not in any circumstances." Our determination to strengthen and defend the gains of socialism and peace on earth is unshakable.

The Soviet Armed Forces are vigilantly guarding peace and socialism's gains. The sons of the people -- the army and navy servicemen -- have taken to heart the CPSU Central Committee May Day slogan addressed to them: Safely protect our people's peaceful, constructive labor and the gains of socialism. They are deeply aware of their great responsibility for the Soviet motherland's security, and they see it as their duty to the people to be always on the alert and in a state of combat readiness guaranteeing the immediate repulse of any aggressor.

The May Day holiday is marching through the cities and villages of our motherland. The Soviet people are celebrating it in a working, militant mood. Our thoughts and our feelings are with the beloved socialist motherland and with the Communist Party, which is leading us along the correct Leninist path. We fervently believe the will and labor of millions of Soviet people will raise our motherland to a qualitatively new level of economic, social and spiritual progress, and we proclaim fervently and enthusiastically:

Forward along the Leninist course of the 27th CPSU Congress, along the path of communist creation and peace!

/6091
CSO: 5200/1488

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTS ON UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION SESSION

Session Opens

LD042115 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 4 May 87

[Text] New York, 4 May (TASS)--The annual session of the UN Commission on Disarmament opened here today. The first session approved the agenda which includes problems linked with putting an end to the race of conventional and nuclear armaments, arms control, reduction of military budgets, consideration of the United Nations' role in disarmament.

Dmitr Kostov (Bulgaria), elected chairman of the session, underlined that the disarmament commission had met in a complicated and crucial period. A new political thinking and a new mode of actions of states, above all, in the sphere of limitation of the arms race and in disarmament, are now insistently necessary, as never before. The efforts of the international community, including the UN Commission on Disarmament, he said, are also bound to play a substantial role in these matters.

Ukrainian Delegate Speaks

LD052042 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 5 May 87

[Text] New York, 5 May (TASS)--The general discussion that opened at the annual session of the UN Disarmament Commission today centers attention on topical problems of the present: Limitation of the arms race, concrete steps to reduce the danger of war, improvement of the international situation.

The delegates of Austria, Bulgaria, GDR, and other countries noted that in the nuclear-space age no state can be made safe by military-technical systems, escalating the arms race. Renunciation of the unrestrained build-up of military arsenals and then disarmament should become a component part of collective efforts aimed at ensuring a really safe world, said permanent representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Gennadiy Udovenko.

Bloc Proposes Naval Limits

LD122005 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT 12 May 87

[Text] New York, 12 May (TASS)--TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov reports:

The curbing of the arms race on seas and oceans can be an important contribution toward creating a system of all-embracing security of states. This thesis is central to a working document "Naval arms and disarmament in this sphere" submitted by the delegations of Bulgaria, the GDR and the Soviet Union today to an annual session of the United Nations Commission on Disarmament underway here.

The authors of the document declared emphatically in favor of urgent measures for the limitation of nuclear naval arms. They noted that the Soviet Union, as one of the leading nuclear powers, more than once expressed consent to consider possible ways of reducing this component of naval might of states in the overall context of measures for its limitation and at appropriate talks on nuclear disarmament. However, it is necessary to agree already at the present stage on non-emplacement of nuclear arms on sea and ocean expanses, on their withdrawal from certain sea and ocean areas, the document says.

Socialist countries attach priority importance to the decision on non-deployment of nuclear weapons in the Indian Ocean and in the Mediterranean. They emphasise that the Soviet Union is prepared to assume the commitments not to deploy such weapons in the Indian Ocean and countries of the region if such commitments are assumed by all nuclear powers. The Soviet proposes the withdrawal in the Mediterranean of ships--nuclear weapons carriers and its refraining from the development of nuclear weapons in the territories of Mediterranean countries not having such weapons remain valid.

Funds saved as a result of limitation and reduction of naval activity and armaments would be channelled for purposes of peaceful development, including the establishment of international cooperation in prospecting and development of world ocean, the document says.

Bloc Proposal on 'All Aspects'

LD132214 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 13 May 87

["Socialist Countries on Arms Control"--TASS headline]

[Text] New York, 13 May (TASS)--The constructive proposals of socialist countries on questions of control must give an additional impetus to the talks on arms limitation. This is pointed to the United Nations Commission on Disarmament by the delegations of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia in the working document "On Arms Control in All Its Aspects" they tabled today.

measures for control are simply necessary under the present international relations, with the deficit of mutual confidence. Reliable and comprehensive verification is an inseparable measure accompanying all efforts for the implementation of confidence-building measures and arms reduction. Verification is called upon to become one of the most important guarantees of the system of international security, of the durability of its foundations in the military area, the authors of the document stress.

They analyze in detail the problem of control of the termination of nuclear weapon tests. The possibilities of national technical means in the area have long since rendered groundless any references to the difficulties of verification, the document says. If the United States ultimately agrees to end nuclear testing on a basis of reciprocity with the USSR, an effective control can fully be ensured by the combination of national technical means and international procedures, including on-site inspections wherever necessary. The Soviet-American experiment in Semipalatinsk was in a certain degree a prototype of such control.

The Soviet Union proposed to consider the question also of creating an international mechanism of verification of ending nuclear weapon tests, the socialist countries note. They believe that the most suitable framework for this are the United Nations organization or the conference on disarmament.

/9274
CSO, 5200/1498

RELATED ISSUES

COMMUNIST EDITORS MEET, DISCUSS ROLE IN PEACE STRUGGLE

PM071607 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "The Truth About Socialism and Peace: Meeting of Editors of the Communist and Democratic Press"]

[Excerpts] The attractiveness of socialism, which puts into practice the idea of the free development of the peoples and the idea of peaceful coexistence among states, increases in direct relation to the concrete successes of each socialist country. To show in a well argued way the life-giving potential of socialism in resolving mankind's fundamental needs, to analyze more thoroughly the specific features of the development of progressive movements in different countries, to more boldly eradicate shortcomings in social life, and to more vigorously expose the intrigues of imperialism, which is forcing the nuclear arms race on the world -- that is the range of tasks on the agenda of the meeting of editors of the communist and democratic press that opened in Moscow 3 May. Representatives of the press from more than 100 parties as well as from the journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA and AL-NAHJ, the journal of the Arab countries' communist and workers parties, have come to this forum, which coincides with Press Day and the 75th anniversary of the publication of the first issue of PRAVDA.

Welcoming the participants in the meeting, V.G. Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA, called on his colleagues to show a high sense of responsibility in view of the exacerbated contradictions in the capitalist world and the revolutionary transformations in Soviet society's socioeconomic life. Soviet press workers, he said, are proud to be in the forefront of restructuring. The PRAVDA editorial office alone receives 2,000 letters a day as the result of its dialogue with the readers. The readers' mail sent to other editorial offices is also increasing greatly. This increase means for Soviet journalists not just a restoration of the people's confidence in the press but also a tremendous responsibility for every word that newspapers print. Irrespective of whether they are writing about the everyday life of the Soviet agricultural industry or the United States' undeclared war against Nicaragua.

The meeting noted that the journalist's word is of tremendous significance in propagandizing the policy of peace and in the struggle for the planet's nuclear-free future. This was mentioned by Dieter Brueckner, deputy chief editor of NEUES DEUTSCHLAND (SED), Pierre Beauvois, Belgian Communist Party Central Committee member and LE DRAPEAU ROUGE political director, Heinz Gruenberg, member of the bureau of the SEW Board and DIE WAHRHEIT chief editor, and Erkki Susi [name as published], member of

the Central Committee Politburo of the Finnish Communist Party's organizations and TIEONANTAJA editor.

Developing this idea, Ladongiyn Tudev [name as published], MPRP Central Committee member and UNEN chief editor, stressed that the honorable corps of journalists can now play a role in the great mission of peace and mutual understanding among people and the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. The USSR and the other socialist countries are doing their utmost to translate the ideas of the new thinking to the plane of practical policy. A vivid example of that is provided by their constructive proposals aimed at reducing and eliminating all kinds of weapons.

Expressing in concrete terms the theme taken up by the speakers, Francois Hilsum, French Communist Party Central Committee member and L'HUMANITE DIMANCHE chief editor, said that these initiatives create real preconditions for preserving world peace. He was supported by Hans Kloster, member of the Communist Party of Denmark Central Committee and of the editorial council of LAND OG FOLK, and Adzhoy Kumar Roy [name as published], Communist Party of Bangladesh Central Committee secretary and EKOTA editorial collegium member.

The interests of preventing thermonuclear war demand the intensification of the struggle to forestall U.S. imperialism's military policy and the energetic development of the anti-imperialist and antiwar movement in defense of peace on all continents. This was stressed by Pak Chong-sun, deputy chief editor of NODONG SINMUN (Workers Party of Korea), S. Ramachandra Pillai [name as published], Communist Party of India-Marxist Central Committee member and DESHABKHIMANI [name as published] chief editor, Carlos Francisco Changmarin, People's Party of Panama Central Committee Politburo member and UNIDAD chief editor, and Hubert Cambier, LE DRAPEAU ROUGE correspondent.

[Editorial note: TASS also lists the following additional participants in the forum: Adane Fettle-vork, deputy chief editor of the Workers Party of Ethiopia newspaper SERTO ADER; Jerzy Majka, PZPR Central Committee member and TRYBUNA LUDU chief editor; Ion Matran, RCP Central Committee member and SCINTEIA chief editor; Poli V. Parakkal, Communist Party of India National Council member and NEW AGE chief editor; Herbert Naumann, SED Central Committee member and NEUES DEUTSCHLAND chief editor; Som Kim Suor, Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee member and PRACHEACHON chief editor; Juan Marrero of the Cuban newspaper GRANMA; Falih 'Abd al-Jabbar, editor-secretary of the editorial office of AL-THAQAFAH AL-JADIDAH (Iraqi Communist Party); Emile Habibi, Communist Party of Israel Central Committee Politburo member and AL-ITTIHAD chief editor; Erkki Kaupila, Finnish Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and KANSAN UUTISET chief editor; Donald Ramotar, Guyana People's Progressive Party Central Committee Executive Committee member representing THE MIRROR; Jose Merino, Costa Rican People's Party Central Committee Political Commission member and LIBERTAD editor; Monty Johnston, Communist Party of Great Britain Executive Committee member (SEVEN DAYS); Jorge Enrique Mendoza, Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee member and GRANMA chief editor; Son Khamvanvongsa, Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee candidate member, State Committee for Information and Radio and Television Broadcasting chairman and PASASON chief editor; Ahmad 'Abdallah Salih, Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee member and AL-THAWRI chief editor; and Yoshinori Yoshioka, Japan Communist Party Central Committee Presidium Permanent Bureau member and AKAHATA chief editor.]

/6091

CSO: 5200/1488

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: RETIRED NATO, PACT GENERALS END VIENNA MEETING

LD071845 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 7 May 87

[Text] Vienna May 7 TASS -- The fourth meeting of retired generals and admirals of member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO ended here today. It was attended by retired senior officers from Bulgaria, Britain, Hungary, Greece, Holland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Union was represented by a delegation of the "Retired Soviet Generals and Admirals for Peace and Disarmament" group under the Soviet Peace Committee.

Work was conducted at plenary meetings and in commissions that studied questions of global, regional and national security, effective steps to rid Europe of nuclear arms and questions of continuing and consolidating the process of confidence-building within the framework of the Helsinki Final Act.

The participants in the meeting noted the importance of the new thinking in the nuclear age. They stressed that the existing proposals in the field of disarmament, if adopted, could bring about a radical change both in political and military relations between the two military alliances in Europe as well as at the talks on arms control. It is necessary to press for the new thinking to be practiced, for the creation as a result of this new structures of security and the abolition of the deeply entrenched notion that new types of weapons and military strength supposedly can guarantee security.

The meeting adopted a concluding document which says that the establishment and maintenance of regular contacts between the commander-in-chief of the joint armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the supreme commander-in-chief of the Joint NATO Armed Forces in Europe would be a substantial contribution to new thinking in the military field. Such contacts would ensure a regular exchange of views on problems of overall security concerning the military-political situation in Europe.

The question of liquidating the military organisations of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO should be considered as an important step in the formulation of a new concept of European security.

The participants in the meeting declared for the elimination of nuclear weapons and noted that this process should be accompanied by a drastic reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces because their present high level poses a threat to European and general security.

It was agreed to hold the fifth meeting of retired generals and admirals of Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries in 1988 and to discuss at it the question of an alternative policy of global security.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1488

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA REPORT ON EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS' CONFERENCE

PM141341 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 87 Second Edition p 5

[Valeriy Volkov "Commentator's Column": "Realism Gains the Upper Hand"]

[Text] Lisbon--The 15th Congress of the European Community Countries' Union of Socialist and Social Democratic Parties has completed work in Estoril, a suburban resort outside the Portuguese capital. Eminent political and state figures from European countries, a socialist international delegation, and representatives of other international organizations took part in this forum.

In addition to discussing economic and social problems, which the EEC is encountering great difficulties in solving, the congress participants devoted their main attention, in the opinion of the majority of observers, to the questions of peace, security, and disarmament on the European continent. Delegates spoke in favor of ending nuclear tests (only the French Socialists abstained on this point) and appealed to the United States and the USSR to immediately conclude an agreement on removing medium-range missiles from Europe. In their speeches, delegates highly appraised the Soviet peace initiatives and especially the proposal to eliminate medium-range missiles on the European continent. The congress' final document contains an appeal to renounce the development, testing, and deployment of space weapons and notes the importance of strictly abiding by the ABM Treaty. The forum participants spoke in favor of expanding contacts between the Common Market and CEMA with the aim of reinforcing the detente process on the continent.

In the opinion of European socialist parties, the entire disarmament process must lead to greater political trust and to greater military stability at the lowest possible level.

Assessing the results of the 15th European socialist congress, political observers rightly ask the question: Is Western Europe capable in the present conditions of giving the task of security and cooperation on the continent its "second wind" and moving the task of reducing all types of arms--nuclear, chemical, and conventional--from its present standstill?

The congress in Estoril showed that, under the influence of the Soviet foreign policy initiatives and the struggle for peace now being waged on the continent, the new political thinking is making headway. The peoples of Europe have a

right to hope that the search for ways to peacefully cooperate will continue. Socialists and communists, Catholics and atheists, and people of various political views and ideological beliefs must do everything possible to save mankind from catastrophe. The task of strengthening peace and international security concerns everyone.

/9274
CSO, 5200/1498

RELATED ISSUES

TASS ON ALLEGED U.S. PLANS FOR NEUTRON ARMS DEPLOYMENT IN FRG

Washington, Bonn Silent

LD082021 Moscow Tass in English MT 8 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS--TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Reports in the West German press show that over 100 neutron warheads have already been brought to the U.S. air base in Ramstein near Kaiserslautern. 200 more such warheads will soon be delivered.

Thus, the Pentagon's plans are being implemented and the horrible invention aimed at killing humans while leaving material values intact is being deployed in Europe. Press reports say that such weapons have already been delivered to permanent depots in the area of West German cities of Lanstein, Idar-Oberstein, Baumholder, Kusel, Hamm, Buehl.

Washington took into account the experience of the previous unsuccessful attempt at "neutron penetration" of Western Europe, when a wave of indignation of the people compelled American President Jimmy Carter in 1978 to defer the production of neutron weapons. The current President, Ronald Reagan, refused to heed the voice of indignant public and on August 6, 1981, the anniversary of Hiroshima's atomic bombing, ordered to start large-scale production of neutron weapons, as if deliberately to insult the memory of hundreds of thousands of victims of that criminal action.

This time, fearing new outbreak of indignation, the Pentagon is sending neutron weapons to Western Europe under the pretext of "modification of artillery shells." These charges are marked with meaningless index "B-79". Seeking to camouflage the real essence of modernized ammunition Washington asserts that these were nuclear warheads with a yield of only two kilotons. And it conceals the fact that this modification is meant precisely for transforming the charge into a neutron one by means of insertion of a special module. It deliberately conceals the fact that the explosion of a neutron charge with a yield of one kiloton forms a zone of lethal irradiation on an area of 8 square kilometers. Concealed also are calculations as to how many peaceful people will receive the lethal dose of neutron irradiation in populated localities of densely populated Europe.

New neutron warheads are meant for weapons of 155 and 203 mm calibre. Lance missiles can be fitted out with them. These arms were adopted for service by both U.S. and West German troops. And neutron warheads, as the press asserts,

are meant also for the West German Bundeswehr. The Bundeswehr also has the material basis for this -- self-propelled guns of the needed calibres and other kinds of potential delivery vehicles for neutron warheads. The British "OBSERVER" testified that the British Army, too, is supplied with such neutron charges.

Both Washington and Bonn so far prefer to keep silent about the delivery of neutron charges to Europe and of their distribution to allied armies. But broad peaceful public of the FRG and other West European countries demands that the road to neutron menace be barred, that the Bundeswehr be prevented from getting neutron weapons.

The very idea of neutron bomb looks as a fruit of perverted thinking of politicians and military leaders who lost the sense of responsibility, who do not wish to think in categories of the present. And it should be noted that neutron death is creeping to the European Continent at a time when a real prospect opened for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe.

German CP Data

LD090129 Moscow TASS in English 2310 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Bonn May 8 TASS--TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov reports:

Bonn did not react in any way to the revelations of the deployment with its knowledge in the FRG territory of a new kind of nuclear weapon, neutron weapons. It was reported by the organization of the German Communist Party of Rhineland-Palatinate, and by the television program "Monitor" that secret deployment of neutron weapons was started in Rhineland-Palatinate last year.

These weapons are meant not only for U.S. forces deployed there, but also for the West German Bundeswehr. And this step dangerous for peace is taken despite the fact that Bonn assumed the obligation not to have nuclear weapons.

Data published by the German Communist Party confirm the sinister facts of which the government of Rhineland-Palatinate keeps silent. The authorities fear not without reason that the publishing of such facts might have undesirable consequences for the elections to the Landtag to be held on May 17. For the overwhelming majority of the population demands that nuclear and chemical weapons be removed from the FRG. And the density of such weapons in West Germany is the world's highest.

The date of the German Communist Party shows that 300 neutron warheads for howitzers have already been brought into the FRG. The ammunition was put at the disposal of units of the U.S. Army and the Bundeswehr stationed in Landstein, Idar-Oberstein, Baumholder and Kusel.

It is planned to fit out wth neutron warheads not only field artillery but also Lance missiles and multi-purpose F-16 and Tornado fighter-bombers, silos for warheads close to parking places for aircraft was now being built at the U.S. air bases in Ramstein, Haan and Buehl.

The German Communist Party accused Bonn of playing with marked cards. Indeed, in his government statement in the Bundestag on Thursday Chancellor Helmut Kohl spoke of NATO's great contribution to disarmament. He emphasized that a certain amount of nuclear charges was removed from Europe in the recent years. The chancellor, however, has not mentioned the fact that this was obsolete ammunition which was to be removed anyway. He said nothing either of the fact that most up-to-date nuclear ammunition, neutron charges, with which the Bundeswehr is also being equipped, is brought to the FRG from the USA. And all this is done at a time when European peoples have a vitally-important task of embarking on real disarmament the road to which is opened by the new Soviet proposals.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1488

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET OFFICERS WRITE ON V-E DAY

Minister of Defense

PM110945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 87 First Edition p 2

[Article by USSR Minister of Defense Marshal of the Soviet Union S. L. Sokolov: "Victory for the Sake of Peace"]

[Excerpt]

Today is the 42d anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War. Together with Soviet people this great and joyful holiday is being celebrated by the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and all progressive mankind. In our country it is taking place in an atmosphere of vigorous nationwide work on the fulfillment of the decisions of the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum and preparation for a fitting greeting to the 70th anniversary of Great October. Restructuring is gathering momentum and the revolutionary renewal of all aspects of our society's life is under way.

II.

The results of World War II did not suit international imperialism. Soon after the victory, the U.S. ruling circles, possessing a monopoly on nuclear weapons, launched preparations for war against the USSR. It renounced the political and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union which had been carried out in the years of the joint struggle against fascism in the framework of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. The United States effected an abrupt turnaround toward confrontation and began the anti-Soviet, antisocialist "Cold War" and a race for nuclear and other arms.

Today, through the fault of imperialism, the international situation is alarming and dangerous. Implementing more and more new militarist programs, the United States is gambling particularly on SDI with whose implementation are linked hopes for achieving military superiority over the USSR. Aggressive military doctrines and concepts are being worked out which envisage the unleashing and waging of global and "limited" nuclear and conventional wars against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. West German revanchism and Japanese militarism which are fighting to smash the territorial and political realities which have taken shape as a result of the Victory, are raising their heads with the support of the imperialist reaction.

The adventurist policy of imperialism which threatens mankind with nuclear catastrophe is being countered by the peace-loving course of the USSR and of the whole socialist community. The lessons of the last war are taken into account in this course. The

most important of these lessons is that it is necessary to struggle against war before it has even begun. In the thirties it proved impossible to avert a world war through the fault of the Western powers which refused to support the Soviet proposals for organizing a joint rebuff to the aggressor because they were counting on destroying socialism with the aid of the fascist war machine. And only in the course of the war, when faced with the mounting threat of fascist enslavement, were they forced to pool their efforts with the USSR in the struggle against the aggressors.

The creation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition provided valuable experience of cooperation between states of opposed systems and of the joint search for and implementation of mutually acceptable decisions and effective actions for the sake of establishing peace. Unfortunately, in the postwar period our former allies rejected this experience. The contemporary situation shows with particular cogency its significance and dictates the need for great vigilance by the peoples and for energetic action by all peace-loving forces against the aggressive, adventurist course of the reactionary circles which are nudging the world toward war, but this time an immeasurably more devastating war -- a nuclear war. The unleashing of such a war is tantamount to self-destruction, and will lead to mankind's perishing.

A world war in the nuclear and space age is something obsolete and has ceased to be a means of achieving political goals. Contentious problems, even the most acute are difficult, can and must be resolved only around the negotiating table. A realization of this, a realization of the need to renounce wars and strong-arm policy in international affairs constitute the essence of the new political thinking and of the new approaches to questions of war and peace. The way of thinking and acting based on the concept of "nuclear deterrence" is now unacceptable. The continuation of the arms race is senseless and extremely dangerous. By building up military preparations, the United States is counting on achieving superiority over the USSR. Clearly the USSR will not permit this. "...The Soviet Union does not lay claim to greater security, and will not settle for less security," M.S. Gorbachev declared in the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress. Any attempt to disrupt the existing military equilibrium will be negated. The necessary response will be found even if a threat to the USSR and the socialist community should appear from space.

But this is not something of our choosing. We are against rivalry in arms and against the expenditure of effort and money which leads to the undermining of international security and to increasingly unpredictable war-brinkmanship.

The USSR regards the struggle against the threat of nuclear catastrophe as a most important task. The Soviet program for a nuclear-free world put forward in January 1986, the comprehensive system of international security worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress, the radical proposals at Reykjavik, and other peace-loving steps by the USSR are aimed at solving this task.

Great opportunities for starting real disarmament and for a decisive change for the better in international relations are revealed by the initiatives recently put forward by the Soviet Union for eliminating medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe given the establishment of the strictest system of verifying compliance with the pledges adopted by the sides on this score, and also by the initiatives on questions of reducing tactical nuclear means, armed forces, and conventional arms in Europe. Moreover, the Soviet Union has proposed that key provisions be worked out for reducing strategic offensive arms and for preventing the militarization of space, and also on talks on banning all nuclear tests.

The Soviet initiatives are an expression of the USSR's good will and of its firm determination to safeguard the most precious thing which Victory gave us -- universal peace.

III.

The USSR has been forced to combine its peace-loving policy with constant concern to ensure the reliable defense of socialism's gains. The need for such defense stems from the lessons of the Great Patriotic War and of the contemporary situation in the world. As long as international reaction spurs on the arms race, as long as it does not renounce a policy of social revenge and "crusades" against socialism, says the CPSU Central Committee Address to the Soviet People in connection with the 70th anniversary of Great October, the CPSU and Soviet state will do everything necessary to maintain the defensive might of our country and of the socialist community at the due level.

The USSR Armed Forces stand guard over the peaceful labor of the Soviet people. The development and improvement of these forces is being carried out along the same channel as our state-wide building and in strict conformity with the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine while combat readiness is being maintained at a level which will guarantee that aggression, wheresoever it may originate, will be successfully repulsed.

Victory in the Great Patriotic War which was gained for the sake of peace, lives on in today's patriotic deeds and achievements of our country's working people. The intentions of Soviet people are linked not with war but with peace, with creative labor. But the stern reality of our time is such that it is necessary to struggle for peace. It needs defending against the military adventures and intrigues of imperialism. This task is being worthily fulfilled by the Soviet Armed Forces together with the fraternal armies of the Warsaw Pact member states. They are vigilantly standing guard over the motherland and the gains of socialism, and are reliably safeguarding peace on earth.

First Deputy Minister

LD091032 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0645 GMT 9 May 87

[Address by Army General Petr Georgiyevich Lushev, USSR first deputy minister of defense, on World War II Victory Day--live or recorded]

[Excerpts] Comrades, the Great Patriotic War ended 42 years ago. That day in May, 1945, has forever entered the consciousness of the Soviet people and the whole of progressive mankind as a symbol of the invincibility of socialism. And the more time goes by, the more clearly and in greater relief the greatness of the Soviet people's feat appears to the world.

In spite of the stern lessons of history, the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States and other NATO countries have not renounced their adventurist designs to crush socialism by force of arms. This makes it incumbent upon the Soviet Union to do all that is necessary to make itself and its allies secure against sudden aggression. Thanks to the tireless concern of the CPSU over strengthening the country's defenses, and thanks to the selfless work of our people, military-strategical parity has come about between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

This has still further strengthened the positions of the Soviet Union, the countries of socialism, and of all progressive forces, and has overturned the expectations of the aggressive circles of imperialism of victory in war.

Nonetheless, the world situation remains complex and tense. Reactionary U.S. forces are striving to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union at all costs, and to dictate their will to other states and peoples. Openly gambling on military force, the United States is continuing to step up the arms race. It places special emphasis on long-term programs to improve its land-, sea-, and air-borne nuclear missile forces. A large-scale program of preparing for and waging chemical and biological warfare is being implemented. Work related to the creation of weapons based on new principles of physics is being stepped up.

A great danger to the cause of peace is presented by U.S. plans to militarize space. "Star Wars" plans are an attempt to acquire the capability to deliver a nuclear blow at the Soviet Union with impunity, sheltering from retribution behind an antimissile space shield.

Adventurism and readiness to put at risk the vital interests of mankind in the name of attaining the anti-people's selfish aims of capitalist monopolies are the distinguishing features of the foreign policy of the militant circles of U.S. imperialism.

Glancing back mentally to the events of World War II and its lasting lessons, we know that you have to fight against war before it starts. The tireless struggle for peace and to curb the arms race is a main direction of the foreign policy activity of the Soviet Union. From the first act of legislation, Lenin's Decree on Peace, our state has persistently and consistently advocated the prevention of wars.

The Soviet people believe in the triumph of reason and of the new way of political thinking, they believe that the policy of detente and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems are to be the basis of their relations, and they believe in ridding mankind of the nuclear threat. The USSR's new peace initiatives in the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons stand for a real prospect of building a nuclear-free world. It is time for the United States and its NATO partners to recognize that in the nuclear age the only way to real national security is through reduction in the level of military confrontation -- the reduction and, in the final analysis, the total abolition of nuclear and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

Memory is a priceless possession. Today we are recalling the Great Patriotic War so that we might realize once again just how great is the treachery of imperialism. That is why, while putting forward innovative ideas and constructive proposals, intended to ensure security and cooperation among peoples, we are under no illusions: taking into account the tension in the international situation and the aspiration of U.S. aggressive circles for world domination, the CPSU takes all necessary measures to strengthen the country's defense capability.

Deputy Minister Tretyak

LD071159 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 7 May 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, 7 May (TASS)--A TASS correspondent writes:

"I hate war," said Ivan Tretyak, deputy minister of defence of the USSR. The 64-year-old general of the army gave an interview to a TASS correspondent on the eve of 9 May, the day of the victory over Nazi Germany.

The general who had gone to the front at the age of 17 and saw its end at the age of 32 in the rank of lieutenant-colonel and was awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, the general is still young-looking and braced now, 42 years after the victorious assault of the Reichstag.

"War is a sea of blood and sweat. At times it brings with it irreversible changes in the state of mind of people who did not endure the tremendous stress," he said. "My war buddies and I cursed the war even when we were receiving combat awards."

And the concluding question about Soviet military policy. In answer to this question the general mentioned the Soviet Union's obligations not to be the first to use nuclear weapons or to orbit them.

He recalled the announcement of the Soviet moratorium on further deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR, the removal of part of missiles from operational duty, and the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests.

"None of these steps were supported by the United States and its allies," Ivan Tretyak said. "The facts confirm the peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union".

"Our military construction is intended exclusively for defence against an outside aggression. And it cannot be otherwise in the country where the lessons of the bloody battle against fascism are not forgotten."

Deputy Minister for Rear Services

PM131611 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 20, May 87 (Signed to press 7 May 87) p 6

[Article by Hero of the Soviet Union Marshal of the Soviet Union S. K. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services: "May 9th--Victory Day: The Great Cannot Be Forgotten"]

[Excerpts] It is 42 years since that bright day in May when the Soviet people's battle against fascism, unprecedented in scale and ferocity, culminated in victory. Numerous accomplishments have been achieved in the decades since then, but the events of those truly heroic years have not been erased from memory. The great cannot be forgotten.

Forces operating against detente and disarmament and whipping up tension in relations between states are still active in the capitalist world today.

The bosses of the U.S. military-industrial complex are striving to disrupt the military-strategic parity come what may, and to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union through SDI. The Pentagon spends colossal amounts of money on the development [razrabotka] of strike offensive weapons. The U.S. military budget increases each year. For example, the military department requested \$12 billion for 1988 and \$32.4 billion for 1989. The entire military program for the 1988-92 5-year period will demand the appropriation of \$1.7 trillion.

"The contemporary complex international situation," the CPSU Central Committee January 1986 note, "and the desire of bellicose U.S. imperialist circles to disrupt the military-strategic parity and achieve nuclear superiority, demand the fastest possible buildup of economic potential, the utmost strengthening of our country's defense capacity, the maintenance of the country's defense capability at the proper level, high standards of training and combat readiness in the Armed Forces, and constant vigilance."

Thanks to the party's concern and the efforts of the entire people, the Soviet Armed Forces are developing with due consideration for the international situation and in line with the level achieved in scientific and technical progress. They are supplied with first-class weapons and combat equipment.

Feeling legitimately proud of the powerful weapons we possess, Soviet servicemen pay due tribute to the workers, designers, engineers, and technicians whose minds and hands have created the most modern missiles, tanks, ships, aircraft....

Chief of Staff

PM131831 Moscow KRAYNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 May 87 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. F. Akhromeyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and first deputy defense minister of the USSR: "The Great Victory"]

[Excerpt]

II.

The chief historical lesson of World War II is that it is necessary to wage a tireless and vigorous struggle against war before it begins.

The terrible threat of war has loomed over our country and the world as a whole more than once since the war. Sinister plans for a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union have repeatedly been drawn up in the United States. Their implementation could have led the world to an irreparable catastrophe. But thanks to peace-loving forces' vigilance, the imperialists have been unable to launch a large war. For 42 years now the Soviet people and the peoples of Europe and other continents have lived in conditions of peace ensured thanks to the CPSU's peace-loving Leninist foreign policy course and as a result of the Soviet people's heroic labor, the successes of Soviet science and technology, and the maintenance of the combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces and the fraternal socialist countries' armies at the requisite level.

The 27th CPSU Congress laid down the foreign policy goals and tasks of the CPSU and Soviet state. They are aimed at strengthening peace, ending the arms race, and maintaining military equilibrium between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO bloc at the lowest possible level. The 27th CPSU Congress particularly stressed the /defensive thrust of Soviet military doctrine/. [passage between slantlines published in boldface] The USSR has stated that it will never be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee confirmed in Budapest in June 1986 that the Warsaw Pact countries will under no circumstances initiate hostilities against

any state or military alliance unless they are themselves the object of attack. This orientation in the allied socialist states' policy stems objectively from the nature of their social system and their desire for peace.

The Soviet Union and its allies unreservedly reject war as a means of resolving interstate political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes. They are convinced opponents of war in any form. The allied socialist states proceed from the premise that in present-day conditions neither nuclear nor conventional must in any circumstances be allowed, it must not be unleashed. Nuclear war can only lead to mankind's destruction. A world war involving the use of conventional means will, if it is launched by an aggressor, also bring mankind incalculable and even unpredictable disasters and suffering.

The Soviet Union and its allies proceed from the conviction that no world problems including the historical dispute between socialism and capitalism, can be resolved by military means.

This approach to solving the problems of war and peace is the firm conviction of all the Soviet people. In the struggle for peace Soviet people of all nationalities, Communists, nonparty people, citizens, and military personnel all wholly support the peace policy elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress.

The foreign policy of the Communist Party and Soviet state is aimed at obstructing the path to war, halting the arms race, and securing a peaceful life for the peoples. This is its chief objective.

The persistent search for ways to maintain the military equilibrium at the lowest possible level, to create an all-embracing international security system, to eliminate nuclear arms, and to reduce armed forces and conventional arms is an expression of deep awareness of the fundamentally new situation obtaining in the nuclear space age and a law-governed development of Soviet foreign policy. The peace initiatives of our party and state formulated in recent years are directed toward this.

The times have past when the leaders of the NATO bloc countries could refuse to examine the Soviet Union's proposals in detail, dismissing them as mere propaganda.

However, even now they are generally not prepared to hold constructive talks. While verbally acknowledging the importance of the USSR's peace proposals, in practice the U.S. Administration continues to pile up one obstacle after another in the way of building a nuclear-free world.

Essentially opposing the Soviet Union's proposed program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, discarding the 1972 Interim Agreement on the Limitation of Strategic Arms (SALT I) and the SALT II Treaty, and seeking to revise the ABM Treaty, reactionary forces in the United States and certain of the allied NATO countries are working not to curb the arms race or limit their military programs in any way but to create [sozdat], test, and put strike weapons into outer space. The thesis that the peoples' security can only be secured by creating more and more new sophisticated weapons systems -- both nuclear and conventional -- is still widely propounded in the United States and other NATO countries. It is even claimed that Europe owes its long peace solely to the nuclear arms race and that it alone can guarantee future security. "Counting on nuclear deterrence," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed during his visit to Prague in April, "is extremely dangerous... We consider the very thought that mankind is condemned to live under the constant, implacable threat of self-destruction to be criminal.

Counting on the retention of nuclear weapons is tantamount to depriving people of hope for the future."

The arms race and military rivalry have caused wars in the past. Now, when many tens of thousands of nuclear warheads have been stockpiled, the desire to further increase their numbers and improve nuclear weapons is both absurd and criminal. This is a self-evident truth. However, influential imperialist circles bent on world domination still refuse to understand this. The Reagan administration "has discovered an imbalance" in armaments between the United States and the USSR in the Soviet Union's favor. Using this deliberate untruth as a cover, the U.S. leadership is intent on considerably augmenting its nuclear arsenal by the end of the eighties and transferring the arms race to outer space. Here the task is, on the one hand, to protect U.S. territory beneath multilayered ABM defenses and thereby deprive the USSR of the ability to deliver a counterstrike in the event of nuclear aggression against it, while, on the other hand, deploying in outer space new strategic strike means which, combined with strategic offensive forces, would afford the United States, now rendered "invulnerable," the opportunity to constantly threaten the Soviet Union. All this is being done to smash the military equilibrium existing between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc and achieve military superiority. But they will fail in this. The Soviet Union will not allow the existing military equilibrium to be reached.

In present-day conditions it is possible to prevent world war -- whether nuclear or conventional -- only by the joint efforts of all countries and peoples. After all, the victory over the Nazis, who intended to reverse the course of history and establish on earth their own racist "new order" aimed against mankind, was won only thanks to the concerted efforts of the peoples of the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition. The coalition was a truly great union of fighters against the fascist scourge. The blood jointly shed by Soviet, British, French, American, Chinese and many other people showed that no differences of political or social system or divergences of views can serve as obstacles when the peoples are faced with terrible danger. That is how it was during the war against fascism and Japanese militarism. The situation is different today. But in the face of the threat of nuclear catastrophe a great union of all forces fighting for peace, a sensible policy, and a desire to achieve accords for the sake of peace on our planet on the part of the state leaders of states belonging to different social systems is vitally necessary for mankind.

Only an active peace policy ensuring that war is averted can simultaneously ensure a creative life and mankind's activity. The transition to such a policy demands a radical break with the way of thinking and acting in the international arena that has existed for centuries. Nowadays it is impossible to ensure security merely by improving one's sword and shield, even if they are a space sword and shield.

The colossal quantities of nuclear weapons are becoming useless from a military standpoint, since they cannot be used without catastrophic consequences for the whole of mankind. And if the United States and the other NATO countries are really concerned about the fate of peace, they should switch from words to actions -- the actions proposed by the Soviet Union in its peace initiatives -- and abandon their futile attempts to make us disarm unilaterally.

The security of each state is directly dependent on the security of all. It can only be achieved by limiting and reducing armaments and strengthening confidence-building measures and international cooperation among countries.

III.

The military threat from imperialism, the desire of aggressive forces to change to their advantage the military equilibrium prevailing in the world, and the attempts by reactionary strata to forcibly impose on the Soviet Union and its allies arrangements in the world that they deem convenient require that the Soviet Armed Forces be maintained at a level that ensures our homeland and its allies are reliably defended.

The Soviet Union keeps a careful watch on imperialism's military preparations and detects and duly evaluates any dangerous trends in this process. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government do every thing necessary to protect our people and the peoples of allied countries from any surprises stemming from the aggressive plans of bellicose reactionary forces and ensure that the country's defense potential is maintained at the necessary level. Our principle is to maintain the Armed Forces and our military potential in a state of rough military equilibrium and at a level sufficient to ensure reliable defense of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact states.

The Army and Navy are equipped in line with these precepts. Our country is capable of resolving any scientific or technical task to prevent superiority from being achieved over us on earth or in space. The Soviet Army and Navy possess modern armaments today.

Troops and naval forces are equipped with various kinds of missiles, armored vehicles, artillery, and modern warplanes, air defense facilities, surface ships, and submarines. We have everything we need to ensure our defense and maintain the military equilibrium. But this is not the mythical "overarmament" imputed to us by propaganda in the West. In no kind of weapon do we seek one-sided military advantages for ourselves or try to outmaneuver the other side with the aim of acquiring "superior force."

Bourgeois propaganda's attempts to portray the Soviet Army as a force posing a threat to other states are rebutted by the truth. The truth is that in the 69 years of their existence the Soviet Armed Forces have never acted as an aggressor or waged wars of aggression and have always solely defended the cause of freedom and independence of their people.

The defensive orientation of Soviet military doctrine presupposes high combat readiness on the part of the Soviet Armed Forces to repulse potential aggression. Our Armed Forces are maintained in such a state of readiness. But this is not done in order to attack anyone but to repulse potential aggression and defend our motherland and its allies.

Defensive counteroperations to repulse enemy aggression form the main element in training our troops and naval forces. They are taught how to conduct combat operations vigorously and resolutely to defeat the aggressor. The personnel are trained to be ever ready to discharge their duty if aggression is launched by imperialist states. The principle of teaching them what they need in a combat situation remains basic to the combat training of troops and naval forces.

The USSR Armed Forces today constitute one of the main factors restraining the aggressive aspirations of reactionary imperialist circles and serve to a guarantee international security. And no matter how hard imperialism's propaganda forces try, they will never succeed in belittling the Soviet Armed Forces' prestige or defaming their glorious combat history and their role and mission today as the army defending socialism, peace, and the security of the peoples.

The Soviet Armed Forces servicemen are preparing to greet the 70th anniversary of the Great October revolution in worthy fashion.

Inspired by the historic decisions adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress, unwaveringly following Lenin's behests to defend the socialist fatherland, and restructuring their activity in tune with the demands of the time, our Army and Navy servicemen continue to see their main task as being to reliably ensure a peaceful life for Soviet people and the peoples of fraternal countries. Our party's conclusion that the Soviet Union aspires to no greater security than others but will never assent to any lesser security either serves for them as a program guide to action.

The crushing blows struck by the Soviet Armed Forces in the spring of 1945 marked the end of the fascist Reich. The strike detachment of imperialism -- Hitler's fascism and militarist Japan -- which had encroached on the freedom and independence of our motherland and other freedom-loving countries and wanted to bring the whole world to its knees, was routed, destroyed, and consigned to the scrapheap of history. The aggressors were taught a harsh but just lesson.

Today the sons and grandsons of the heroes of the Great Patriotic War are performing their combat duty in the Soviet Armed Forces.

Continuing the glorious traditions of the participants in the Great Patriotic War boundlessly devoted to their people, the Communist Party, and the Soviet Government, they mount watchful guard over Soviet people's peaceful, creative labor, socialism, and peace.

Deputy Minister Views INF

LD092229 Moscow International Service in Polish 1800 GMT 9 May 87

[Unidentified reporters' interview with USSR deputy minister of defense, Army General Vitaliy Shabanov, on the occasion of Victory Day in the USSR; date and place not specified; Shabanov speaks in Russian with superimposed Polish translation--recorded]

[Text] [Reporter] Comrade general, please tell us briefly about the significance of the victory over Hitlerite fascism.

[Shabanov] Its main significance rests on the fact that humanity was freed from the spread of fascist bestiality and the nations of many countries of Europe from Hitlerite slavery. The victory paved the way for revolutionary transformations in the world. The world socialist system arose, standing in the defense of peace. The victory over fascist Germany demonstrated the attributes and possibilities of the socialist system.

[Reporter] For 42 years our planet has not known world wars. Fortunately, there have only been two of them. Thanks to what, in your opinion, has it been possible to avoid world conflict through all these years?

[Shabanov] After the utter defeat of Hitlerite Germany and, at the same time, militarist Japan, the nations of our planet believed that, once and for all,

the threat of a new world war would disappear once and for all. Unfortunately, these hopes were not fulfilled. The ideas of dominating the world do not let the reactionary forces of militarism sleep easy. This time, they are the strongest in the United States. American imperialism, in the name of its great power aspirations, the policy of neoglobalism, seeks to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union. In the name of attaining this end it has stoked up an unprecedented arms race of all types. It seeks to extend it into space. Such a quantity of arms has been accumulated in the world that it would suffice for the destruction of all living organisms many times over. The threat of the outbreak of a new world war has thus drastically increased. War has not broken out because the aggressive aspirations of imperialism are being held in check by the defense efforts of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. These efforts have contributed to the formation in the world arena of military-strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Peace has reigned in Europe for over 40 years not because American nuclear weapons exist, but because the countries of the socialist community do not allow the imperialist states to nudge Europe into the abyss of another war.

The years pass, generations change. Human memory will, however, forever retain the colossal losses and suffering of the two world wars. The understanding of the fact that the accumulated reserves of arms do not contribute to our planet's security is growing in the world. Peace on earth can be assured only by their reduction. In putting forward new compromise proposals in the matter of the liquidation of medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union directs itself through one aim only: The reduction of nuclear confrontation, the elimination of the threat of war, and the saving of humanity from nuclear catastrophe.

[Reporter] The Soviet Union puts enormous efforts into seeking the end of the nuclear arms race and the reduction of nuclear weapon stocks. How, in this context, may one evaluate the proposal of the Soviet Union in the matter of the liquidation of missiles and nuclear arms in Europe.

[Shabanov] The meaning of our proposals will be more understandable when I once more repeat that in Europe are located the arms stocks of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries on various carriers: from artillery shells to medium-range missiles. Especially dangerous are nuclear warheads on medium-range rockets. These rockets can reach and destroy, in practice, all cities and other sites on the terrain of Europe. This was one of the main reasons why the Soviet Union presented the proposals for the liquidation of the missiles of the Soviet Union and the United States in (?this tract of) Europe. After this step, the land of Soviets is ready to undertake successive steps contributing to the liquidation of nuclear arms in Europe.

[Reporter] In association with the fact that there has arisen a real possibility of the reduction of medium-range missiles, the NATO leadership is scaring the inhabitants of Western Europe with reports on the significant preponderance of conventional weapons the Warsaw Pact organization purportedly

has at its disposal. NATO threatens that a nuclear-free Western Europe might fall victim to this superiority. Is this really so?

[Shabanov] This is simply the successive ploy of the NATO leadership intended to torpedo the proposals of the Soviet Union in the matter of the liquidation of medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. The Warsaw Pact does not have at its disposal any superiority in conventional weapons over the NATO bloc. All the most competent and objective specialists admit that this is the case. In certain particular types of arms, of course, NATO is preponderant. In others, the Warsaw Pact. Overall, however, as regards conventional arms, relative balance also [as heard] exists.

The military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact, similarly to its member, the Soviet Union, has a defensive character. The claim of the NATO leadership that a nuclear-free Western Europe might fall victim to the aggression of the Warsaw Pact is deprived of all basis. The Warsaw Pact states have never and will never threaten anyone. They do not hold any claims to foreign territory and do not interfere in the internal affairs of other states. We have stated more than once that we will never, in any circumstances, start wartime activities against any state if we are not an object of aggression ourselves. The inhabitants of Western Europe are thus not threatened by anything or anyone from the East.

[Reporter] Comrade general, the initiative on the reduction of missiles in Europe came from the Soviet Union. It also relates, however, to its allies from the Warsaw Pact. How do they treat the Soviet proposals?

[Shabanov] The Soviet Union, clearly, could not undertake [word indistinct] without taking account of the opinion of its allies. The close cooperation of the fraternal socialist states in international matters was also manifested here. This was confirmed by the results of the mutual visits of party and government delegations, and also the statements of the leaders of the socialist states. An important role is played by the regular meetings of the Advisory Political Committee of the Warsaw Pact states. On a part with problems of a general political character, matters associated with the implementation of obligations in the area of the mutual defense of fraternal countries, are considered by it. At the end of this month there will be a further meeting of the Warsaw Pact states Advisory Political Committee in Berlin.

[Reporter] Comrade General, what would you like to wish our listeners on the occasion of the joyful festival of all progressive humanity--Victory Day over fascist Germany?

[Shabanov] Victory day is being celebrated for the 43d time as an event that forces the repeated realization in oneself of the responsibility of every [word indistinct] of peace. Humanity is preparing itself for the entry into the 21st century, which might and should bring unprecedented progress. I would like to stress that victory over fascist Germany was attained through the joint effort of the Soviet nation and the nations of many countries. The significance of this unity in the struggle against a mutual enemy is enormously important. That too is why it is appropriate to struggle in unison, for peace, for rescuing the future of humanity. On Victory Day I wish all foreign listeners unfailing peace and human happiness.

RELATED ISSUES

THAI FOREIGN MINISTER DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN MOSCOW

Talks with Shevardnadze

LD111835 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 11 May 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, 11 May (TASS) — A businesslike and sincere exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-Thai relations and key international problems, above all, those related to the situation in Southeast Asia and the Asian-Pacific region, was held today between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Foreign Minister of the Kingdom of Thailand, Chief Marshal of the Air Force Sitthi Sawetsila, on an official visit in the USSR.

Luncheon Remarks

PM121201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Soviet-Thai Talks"]

[Excerpts] Talks were held in Moscow 11 May between E. A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Air Chief Marshal of the Air Force Sitthi Sawetsila, minister of foreign affairs of the Kingdom of Thailand, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

S. Sawetsila handed over a message from Thailand's Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon, addressed to Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N.I. Ryzhkov.

In the course of the talks there was made a business-like and frank [otkrovennyj] exchange of opinions on matters of Soviet-Thai relations and key international problems, primarily relating to the situation in southeast Asia and the Asian-Pacific region.

During discussion of bilateral relations, satisfaction was expressed with their positive development and the mutual intention was confirmed to continue efforts to deepen political dialogue and expand contacts, including interparliamentary links, exchanges in the field of science, culture, education and sport, which, in the view of the two sides would meet the interests of the peoples of both countries and promote the consolidation of pan-Asian security and cooperation.

E.A. Shevardnadze drew attention to the latest set of USSR proposals on the reduction of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe and their radical reduction in Asia, the implementation of which would make way for other, more profound measures of disarmament and promote a radical improvement in the situation in the world, particularly in Asia. The USSR foreign minister outlined practical steps being implemented by the Soviet Union to realize the initiatives put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Vladivostok and during his visit to India.

Thailand's foreign minister gave a high evaluation of the Soviet proposals in the disarmament sphere, and noted the importance of the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons; he expressed the hope that they would end with specific results, which, he stated, would also promote reduction of tension in Asia.

Sittithi Sawetsila stressed that the initiatives expanded by M.S. Gorbachev in his speech in Vladivostok have provoked great and interested response in countries of Southeast Asia and the entire Asian-Pacific ocean region.

Significant attention was paid to the situation in Southeast Asia.

E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed the principled position of the USSR on the need to settle regional conflict situations, including in South East Asia, by political means, on the basis of durable peace and an atmosphere of goodneighborliness and cooperation should be firmly established in the region.

E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon today in honor of Sittithi Sawetsila, during which an exchange of speeches took place.

Speaking the guests, E.A. Shevardnadze said:

...we know the increased contacts with your country, Mr. Minister. May I recall the speech of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during his Vladivostok speech on the readiness of the Soviet Union to develop links with Thailand. We are deeply satisfied that since then they have in fact been developing, as your visit to Moscow also shows.

In our opinion, it acts as an incentive to something much more significant, understanding that there is but one peace, and that of the highest value.

This peace and mutual coexistence has to become the universal principle of behavior between states in the nuclear space age.

Peaceful coexistence does not boil down to an absence of war. It basically means a renunciation in military confrontation and a rejection of the policy of strength and the threat of force.

There can be no full and calm life for anyone in a world where all are threatened by nuclear weapons, where there exists a danger of the arms race being transferred to space.

There can be no calm or stability in a region in which foreign military bases exist and which is not protected from the military rivalry of nonregional powers.

There can, finally, be no good neighborly relations between countries if they are in a state of conflict or confrontation, or if there is no trust between them.

It is inspiring for us that both our nations hold an analogous view of the need for nuclear disarmament, the prevention of the militarization of space, the unlocking of regional conflicts. We are ready to continue to cooperate closely with your country in the work of reducing and removing the nuclear threat. The support of Thailand for the Soviet-U.S. accord on medium-range nuclear missiles and operational and tactical missiles, and for wider agreements on the radical reduction of nuclear stockpiles is rated highly by the USSR.

Cooperation between us in promoting the concept of comprehensive security and in the practical formation of an appropriate international system could be of great significance.

Our talks today were intended to correlate and, perhaps, to bring our positions closer. The Asian-Pacific region is no small part of the planet. Once we guarantee peace and security in that part, we shall have made mankind safe to a large extent. It is through the example of this region that the interconnection between global and regional security is most evident.

Nuclear-free zones in various parts of the Pacific and Indian Oceans are important steps toward a world free of nuclear weapons.

The lowering of military confrontation in this region and the elimination of foreign military presence here are steps on the road to establishing an all-embracing system of international security.

The development of all-Asiatic dialogue is a component part of the process of strengthening trust on a world wide scale.

The course of the development of events and the logic of this convincingly confirm the vital topicality of the program put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in his speeches in Vladivostok and in the Indian parliament, and the principles expounded in the Delhi Declaration. The ideas of a comprehensive approach to ensuring security, peace and stability in Asia are penetrating more and more deeply into the fabric of interstate relations.

In his reply speech, Sitthi Sawetsila, having expressed his thanks for the attention and hospitality, said *inter alia*:

We have already felt the fresh and open atmosphere which, it seems, also characterizes the new spirit of openness of the current political climate in the Soviet Union.

The visit is taking place soon after your recent trip around one countries of Southeast Asia, during which you also stopped in Bangkok.

The historic speech by General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev in Vladivostok in July last year, and the new active Soviet foreign policy in the Asian-Pacific region, have undoubtedly attracted the attention and gained the interest of the peoples of this region, who welcome the positive aspiration of the Soviet Union to play an active and constructive role in the work of contributing to friendly and fruitful relations between countries. We also aspire to this. We fully share the thought that the process of dialogue is vitally necessary for the development of mutual understanding and cooperation. Proceeding precisely from this conviction, I am making this visit to the Soviet Union on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). When examining the issue of peace and security in Southeast Asia, one cannot fail to consider the central problem of the Kampuchean conflict. It is this problem which has been at the focus of our discussions until the present.

Meets With Gromyko

PMI.31056 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Developing Soviet-Thai Relations"]

[Excerpts]

Any act in international policy affairs is not worth much unless it is dictated by good intentions and the desire to promote the attainment of what is of most value to every person on earth -- a life of peace. And conversely, any step, any proposal, it dictated by the desire to promote the elimination of tension in the world and to ensure that all countries, big and small, work for the cause of peace merits the peoples' gratitude. The people of Thailand and their state leadership are undoubtedly aware that the Soviet Union and its people adhere to the great cause of peace.

Those were the thoughts voiced at the very beginning of a conversation in the Kremlin 12 May by A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at a meeting with Thai Foreign Minister Chiet Marshal of the Air Force Sitthi Sawetsila, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

The Soviet side emphasized that any country striving for peace, no matter in what continent it is situated, will always find in the Soviet Union a reliable partner in the struggle to avert the threat of new war. This applies to Thailand if it will pursue peaceful aims in its foreign policy.

In international relations, A.A. Gromyko noted, fundamental laws exist which are dictated by mankind's highest interests. A special place among these laws belongs to noninterference by states in the internal affairs of other states and the resolution of disputed issues by peaceful means, and only peaceful means.

Thailand's foreign minister said that his country pursues peaceful aims and wishes to live in peace with all neighbors, including Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

There was later an exchange of opinion on some concrete aspects of security in the Asia-Pacific region. The Soviet side emphasized that the United States actions manifested in the concentration of naval forces in the area heighten still more tension and danger for the cause of peace. The Soviet Union, just as many other countries, cannot fail to draw from this corresponding conclusions for its policy.

Andrey Gromyko said that there is an organic interrelationship between the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The large-scale tasks for reorganization and speeding up of social and economic development of the country are closely linked with the struggle for durable peace. In this context the attention of Sitthi Sawetsila was drawn to peace initiatives set out in the statements and speeches of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev.

Thailand's representative spoke about a positive attitude of his country to the Soviet Union's proposals aimed at averting nuclear menace, at safeguarding peace and establishing broad and equal international cooperation.

In conclusion of the conversation, Sitthi Sawetsila handed over a friendly message from Thailand's Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon addressed to Mikhail Gorbachev. Accepting

that document, Andrey Gromyko said that the very fact of the message merits a positive appraisal.

Present during the conversation were I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, V.P. Kasatkin, USSR ambassador to Thailand, and Prachit Rotchanaphruk, Thai ambassador to the USSR.

Interviewed on Visit

LD071826 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 7 May 87

[Excerpts] Bangkok, 7 May (TASS)--Relations between Thailand and the USSR at present can be described as normal ones, Sithi Sawetsila, foreign minister of Thailand, said in an interview with TASS correspondent Boris Chekhonin. "Thai-Soviet relations have developed in a positive direction." He said he believed that the atmosphere formed in those relations had a tendency for a further improvement.

Political relations, cultural and economic ties can be genuinely developed only in conditions of peace. This point of view, the minister said, is shared also by my country. And indeed, look at Thailand's stand on key international problems of our time. In our policy we always proceeded from the principles of international law, justice and respect for the U.N. Charter.

Thailand's two-year participation in the work of the Security Council as its non-permanent member has come to an end just recently.

Our activity in this council speaks for itself. Thailand will continue adhering to the same position. World peace can be preserved only on condition that all states will scrupulously abide by the established international standards and rules of conduct.

The Thai Government paid attention to recent statements on problems of peace in Asia and Pacific. Various ideas aired in this connection are of interest and merit serious attention. We welcome any step or proposal which would serve the cause of peace and prosperity on earth.

"We welcome the Soviet Union's constructive policy towards East-West relations. We hope that the Soviet Union will continue to make genuine efforts to achieve progress on the question of arms control and disarmament for the sake of world peace and security. Thailand welcomes many initiatives put forward by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech in Vladivostok".

"In visiting the Soviet Union I will bring with me goodwill and best of wishes of the government and the people of Thailand to the government and people of the Soviet Union", the minister said in conclusion.

'Joint Announcement' Published

PM151326 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 87 Morning Edition p 4

[**"Joint Announcement on the Visit of the Thai Foreign Minister to the USSR"--
IZVESTIYA headline**]

[Excerpts] Thai Foreign Affairs Minister Sitthi Sawetsila was in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government 10-14 May.

He conveyed a message from Thai Prime Minister P. Tinsulanonda to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The Thai foreign minister was received by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Meetings and conversations took place with V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, B.I. Aristov, USSR minister of foreign trade, and K.F. Katushev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations.

Talks were held between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, in the course of which they continued the frank [otkryvennyj] and friendly exchange of opinions which began in Bangkok in March on questions of Soviet-Thai relations and key international problems, in particular the situation in Southeast Asia and the Asian and Pacific region.

In discussing the international situation E.A. Shevardnadze drew attention to the Soviet Union's efforts to lessen tension and avert the nuclear threat. The great significance was stressed of the USSR's latest comprehensive proposals on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe and their radical reduction in Asia, the implementation of which would pave the way for other, deeper disarmament measures and promote a radical improvement in the situation in the world, and in Asia in particular.

Shevardnadze detailed the practical steps being taken by the Soviet Union to implement the initiatives put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in Vladivostok and during his visit to India.

Sitthi noted his country's desire to seek a substantial lessening of the international tension caused by the arms race, which is seriously undermining security and acting as a brake on the development of all states.

He welcomed the policy of peace and cooperation formulated by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on Vladivostok on 28 July 1986, stressing that it seeks a solution to the problems of security in Asia and the Pacific. He noted the need to strengthen confidence-building measures, which form the basis for fruitful and constructive cooperation among the region's countries.

He also expressed his viewpoint on the Cambodian question, saying he has been instructed by the ASEAN countries to present to the Soviet leadership their position on a Cambodian settlement based on the following fundamental principles: the withdrawal of foreign troops, the implementation of the Cambodian people's right to

self-determination, and the formation of a neutral, nonaligned, and independent Cambodia.

The Thai foreign minister assessed positively the Soviet leaders' statements in favor of the speediest political resolution of the Cambodian problem, and, on behalf of the ASEAN countries, expressed the hope that the Soviet Union will continue its active, constructive participation in efforts to achieve a peaceful, political solution to the Cambodian question.

E.A. Shevardnadze reaffirmed the USSR's principled position on the need for the settlement of regional conflict situations, including those in Southeast Asia, by political means at the conference table, and its interest in seeing lasting peace prevail in that region and an atmosphere of good-neighborliness and cooperation becoming established. The Soviet Union is prepared, to the extent of its opportunities, to promote a settlement of the Cambodian situation together with other states, including the ASEAN and Indochinese countries, and, along with the other permanent members of the UN Security Council, to guarantee generally acceptable accords.

The participants in the talks expressed the conviction that the Thai foreign minister's visit to the USSR and the exchange of opinions which took place will promote the further development of Soviet-Thai relations and the strengthening of mutual understanding between the two countries.

E.A. Shevardnadze, on behalf of the Soviet Government, conveyed an invitation to Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union.

Sitthi invited E.A. Shevardnadze to pay an official visit to Thailand. The invitation was accepted with thanks.

Moscow Broadcast to Thailand

BK141145 Moscow in Thai in Thailand 1100 GMT 15 May 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] Observers in Asia have given a positive assessment of the current Soviet-Thai talks in Moscow. First of all, with respect to ways to develop ties between the two countries, the two sides have shown a desire to further enhance political dialogue and bilateral contacts in various fields.

economic, cultural, and other ties can only flourish in an atmosphere of peace and peaceful coexistence between countries of different social systems, and it is for this reason that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze visited Bangkok not long ago and the Thai foreign minister reciprocated by visiting the Soviet Union. Both officials followed up their previous discussions and showed interest in searching for ways to guarantee security in Asia and the Pacific. The Thai foreign minister noted the broad response of the countries in the region to Soviet initiatives for the area advanced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostok. Sitthi emphasized that the people in Asia and the Pacific have welcomed the positive signs of Soviet willingness to play an earnest and constructive role in promoting friendly relationship and useful cooperation among countries in the region.

The talks in Moscow also revealed close or similar views on a number of urgent international issues. Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze said the fact that both Thailand and the Soviet Union have the same view on the necessity for nuclear disarmament, for keeping militarism from spreading to space, and for removing the impasse from the regional conflicts has given the Soviet Union confidence. A settlement of the Cambodian problem was also discussed in Moscow. The Cambodian problem has complicated relations between the Indochinese and ASEAN countries and has worsened the situation in Southeast Asia, and it is clear the problem needs to be solved. However, there have been variant views about settling the problem. Certain western and other circles have tried to distort the true situation in Cambodia and have charged that the Vietnamese soldiers in Cambodia are occupying the country and that Vietnam has aggressive designs. The motive of their efforts is to foment military tension along the Cambodian-Thai border and worsen confrontation between the ASEAN and Indochinese countries. The foreign military support for the Pol Pot clique is the real threat to Cambodia's security. In this situation, the insistence for immediate withdrawal of Vietnamese army volunteers from Cambodia is tantamount to leaving the Cambodians with the impossible task of defending themselves and allowing the genocidal Pol Pot clique, which killed some 3 million people, to return to power. It is absolutely not permissible to let the country which has suffered for so long to be deprived of friends from outside and to ignore the wishes of its people.

A settlement of the Cambodian problem is not easy but it is quite possible. The proposal of the Indochinese country calling for negotiations with the ASEAN countries could serve as a good basis for a settlement. It should be noted that a group of Vietnamese army volunteers was withdrawn from Cambodia earlier this year. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it supports productive negotiations on settlement of the Cambodian problem between the Indochinese and ASEAN countries.

Receiving Air Chief Marshal Sitthi, Soviet President Andrew Gromyko said his country welcomes and will continue to welcome the fact that Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos have sought to maintain goodneighborly relations with the ASEAN countries.

/9274
CSO, 5200/1498

RELATED ISSUES

INTERNATIONAL ANTIWAR 'DIALOGUE' OPENS IN MOSCOW

Zagladin Addresses Meeting

LD131533 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 13 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 13 TASS -- A nuclear war is a suicide to mankind. This thought underlined many speeches given by participants in the fourth international information meeting of representatives of anti-war organisations opened in Moscow today.

The meeting is attended by delegates from over 150 national anti-war movements and organisations of the broadest spectrum from Western Europe, the United States, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and also from socialist countries.

War should be deleted from the life of peoples. It is necessary that political problems be solved by peaceful means so that confrontation gives place to cooperation, Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the international Department of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his opening address to the meeting. The issue of mankind's survival in the nuclear age has been raised most acutely since the time of Hiroshima. He said that each nation had the right to choose its own way of development. Let each society demonstrate on its own example the advantage of its system. This is the sole right method of reasoning in solving disputable international issues.

Someone in the West argues that a nuclear-free world is utopia for the reason that nuclear weapons have assured peaceful development for well over 40 years now. However, a report by Viktor Komplektov, deputy minister of the USSR, has forcefully shown that further efforts to stockpile nuclear arsenals magnified the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war, especially if the arms race was extended into space.

Many Americans hold that the new political initiatives launched by Mikhail Gorbachev, an outstanding statesman, should be examined most thoroughly by the West, Howard Frazier, executive director of the American anti-war organisation, "Promoting Enduring Peace", Connecticut, told TASS. We believe that Soviet intentions are sincere and hope that the U.S. Administration will accept them, he said.

Jef Lheureux, Belgium, expressed confidence that the forum in Moscow would be a major stage in giving new momentum to the international anti-war movement.

Further Details

LD131731 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 13 May 87

["On Problems of Soviet Foreign Policy" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 13 TASS -- TASS correspondents Vladimir Yegorov and Valery Kostylev report:

"The Soviet foreign policy which, just as in every country, is the extension of the domestic policy, is called upon, above all, to ensure a consistent implementation of profoundly peaceful humanistic tasks", said Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee. He addressed the fourth information meeting -- dialogue of representatives of anti-war organizations from 40 countries that opened today in Moscow.

"Peacefulness has been and continues to be the basis of the Soviet Union's foreign policy since the emergence of our state", Vadim Zagladin says. "There are no grounds to think that there will be changes in this area: The very nature of the Soviet system which precludes gain on the arms race and plundering of other peoples does not tolerate the possibility of such a turn".

The Soviet leadership has drawn most serious conclusions from the establishment of the fact that humanity is threatened with nuclear suicide, he said. This reevaluation resulted in two major programmes: of a nuclear free world and of an all-embracing system of international security. For that purpose, it has been necessary to revise many established views, to which we also adhered. Thus, quite recently we proceeded from the view that a nuclear war can be won. This was recorded also in Soviet documents and in some international documents which we have been working out jointly with our allies. We have now discarded that viewpoint. We heeded the conclusions of scientists that nuclear war will spare no one.

Hence our unilateral steps, such as refraining from being the first to use nuclear weapons, refraining from putting anti satellite arms in space, a moratorium on nuclear explosions that continued for 18 months, Vadim Zagladin said. New proposals on intermediate range missiles in Europe which envisage asymmetrical, far larger reduction in such types of arms by our side, than by the West, stem from our conclusion that nuclear war should not be fought.

The situation shapes in such a way that the further nuclear arms stockpile, the development of electronics due to which a considerable share of the responsibility for decision-making is now shifted from humans to "the intellect of the machines" carries humanity to the threshold beyond which nuclear deterrence ceases to be a guarantee of restraint and entails heightened risks.

This risk will assume horrible proportions if the nuclear arms are spread to space. For to create space arms systems means to relegate a still greater share of responsibility to machinery, to enhance still more the danger of an unpremeditated, unprovoked and unsanctioned, but no less disastrous war.

Noting that the so-called conventional armaments have become close to nuclear arms for their destructive power, Vadim Zagladin said that any war, both nuclear and conventional, should be precluded from the life of society. It is necessary to pass on to a new world order where all conflict situations would be resolved in a political way, through a dialogue, to the order where the right of every people for any socio-political choice would be respected, where priority should be given to mutually advantageous cooperation of states, and not to their confrontation.

Ends 15 May

LD152057 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 15 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS -- By TASS correspondents Vladimir Yegorov, Valeriy Bestylev and Aleksandr Snastin:

Time has come for moving from general peace declarations to practical work in the antiwar campaign. The participants in the fourth meeting of antiwar organisations of the West and the East supported this idea voiced by Genrikh Borovik, chairman of the Soviet peace committee.

The three-day meeting closed in Moscow today.

Representatives of 169 national and international antiwar organisations from 40 countries took part in the discussions. More than 300 peace activists set forth specific proposals aimed at stepping up the campaign against the arms race and preventing nuclear war.

Speakers voiced a unanimous opinion that security could not be ensured through the efforts of only one country as it concerns all countries.

They said nuclear war could not be won. Peace could be ensured only by political rather than military means.

David Thompson of Canada, a representative of the international organisation Scientists for Nuclear Disarmament, who spoke on behalf of the group which worked on military-strategic aspects of international security, emphasised the importance of the Soviet proposals to eliminate nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass annihilation.

Speakers from the working group "International Security: Economic Aspects" expressed the conviction that peace forces could press governments to reduce allocations for military needs and channel the funds thus released into the solution of social problems.

The meeting considered ecological and energy problems, which had grown into one more threat to mankind. It pointed out the need for active public involvement in the solution of problems of settling local conflicts, ensuring the security of sea communications and nuclear power engineering, and putting an end to international terrorism.

"The Moscow meeting was very useful," Ignias Lindemans, member of the leadership of the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation and chairman of the Flemish branch of the international Catholic organisation Pax Christi, told the TASS correspondents.

He said the openness of Soviet representatives, who had expounded the main goals of the Soviet peace initiatives, had impressed him.

Acute discussions were held in the human rights working group. Some members made attempts to use the meeting for political purposes. U.S. Catholic priest Louis Dolan, leader of the Movement for a Better World, tried to reduce the importance of the extensive and fruitful dialogue to the 10-minute speech of a representative of a Soviet informal organisation calling itself the group for East-West trust.

Professor Mikhail Krutogolovov, film director Stanislav Rostotskiy and others said that there still were people in the West who had not given up the old notions of our country and its policies, and that the freedom of expressing one's views that differed from generally accepted ones reflected the spirit of the deep-going transformations in Soviet society.

The meeting urged all antiwar movements to rally closely together to prevent nuclear catastrophe. The demand for a nuclear-free world is a demand for mankind's immortality, it said.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1498

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTS HONECKER'S EXCHANGE WITH FRG'S VOGEL

LD152201 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 15 May 87

[Text] Berlin May 15 TASS -- The central task of the present is to ensure peace. It is for the first time after the war that the history-making chance has appeared of fully freeing Europe from medium and shorter range missiles, of stopping a further modernization of mass destruction weapons and scrapping them. A statement to this effect has been made by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee, chairman of the GDR Council of State, and Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the SPD floor in the FRG Bundestag, during the scheduled exchange of views in Hubertusstock Castle today. That chance, they stressed, must be used without any strings attached. It shall not be impeded by objections and additional demands. Those who act differently take grave responsibility upon themselves.

Erich Honecker and Hans-Jochen Vogel spoke highly of the project to create a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe and said that that project should be discussed now also at the level of governments. They pointed out that the creation in Europe of a zone free from chemical weapons could become the first step towards a universal ban on that type of mass destruction weapons and declared for a cut in conventional weapons. The fundamental prerequisite for peace in Europe remains the inviolability of borders and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all European states within their present-day borders. Peaceful relations are strengthened also through the exercise of human rights, the way they were spelled out by the United Nations and in the Final Act of the Conference on European Security and Cooperation.

In examining the state of relations between the GDR and the FRG, Erich Honecker and Hans-Jochen Vogel placed on record that after the treaty on the fundamentals of relations was concluded, many problems have been resolved for the benefit of both states and their citizens. A frank exchange of views was held on the question of citizenship and other problems.

The sides again declared for a strict observance and application in full of the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin, which was signed on September 3, 1971.

Erich Honecker and Hans-Jochen Vogel declared for a further development of bilateral contacts at various levels and stressed the need for establishing as soon as possible official relations between the GDR People's Chamber and the FRG Bundestag.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1498

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

SOVIET SCIENTISTS' MEETING--Moscow, 8 May (TASS)--The heads of diplomatic representations of foreign states accredited in the USSR have acquainted themselves with the activities of Soviet scientists on averting the threat of a nuclear war. Today they had a meeting with Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and other members of the committee. It was emphasized that this public organization sets its objective contributing to the delivering of mankind from nuclear weapons. The diplomats were shown a documentary film of the scientists' struggle for peace. The meeting was organized by the Protocol Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1056 GMT 8 May 87 LD] /6091

CSO: 5200/1488

END

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Saharan), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Rd, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hard-cover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

Aug 5, 1987